

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF SELECT COMMITTEES

R E P O R T
OF THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS
COMMITTEE ON RULES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
98TH CONGRESS



FEBRUARY 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Rules

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1983

12-421 O

H682-4

COMMITTEE ON RULES

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida, *Chairman*

GILLIS W. LONG, Louisiana	JAMES H. QUILLEN, Tennessee
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY, Massachusetts	DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio
BUTLER DERRICK, South Carolina	TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON, California	GENE TAYLOR, Missouri
MARTIN FROST, Texas	
DAVID E. BONIOR, Michigan	
TONY P. HALL, Ohio	
ALAN D. WHEAT, Missouri	

A. A. SAYERS, Jr., *Staff Director*

WILLIAM D. CROSBY, Jr., *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

GILLIS W. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*

BUTLER DERRICK, South Carolina	TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
MARTIN FROST, Texas	GENE TAYLOR, Missouri
ALAN D. WHEAT, Missouri	

SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF AND STAFF REPRESENTATIVES

PATTI BIRGE TYSON, *Counsel*
CAROL M. SHERWOOD
WINIFRED WATTS

DONALD R. WOLFENBERGER, *Minority Counsel*
WARREN J. GEURIN

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1983.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am transmitting herewith an updated version of an earlier subcommittee print entitled *Guidelines for the Establishment of Select Committees*.

The original version of this report was issued by our predecessor, the Subcommittee on the Rules and Organization of the House in October 1977. Since that time, the report has provided a valuable model for Members when introducing resolutions to establish select committees and for the Committee on Rules when considering such measures.

The report has been amended to include actions of the House of Representatives relating to select committees through the 97th Congress. No changes are made in the recommendations and criteria set forth in the original report.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

GILLIS W. LONG, *Chairman.*

(11)

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	III
Introduction	1
Guidelines for the establishment of select committees	3
Appendix I.....	7
Model resolution.....	7
Summary of model resolution.....	9
Appendix II	11
Questionnaire.....	11
Appendix III.....	13
Historical review and digest of select committee resolutions, 1947-82.....	13
Select committees of the House of Representatives: Historical context and recent development.....	13
Historical context	13
Select committees of the House since 1946.....	18
Select committees of the U.S. House of Representatives: 1947-82	31
Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of All Matters Related to the Need for Adequate Supplies of Newsprint, Printing, and Wrapping Paper, Paper Products, Paper Pulp and Pulpwood (also known as the Select Committee on Newsprint).....	32
Select Committee on Foreign Aid.....	34
Select Committee To Investigate Transactions on Commodity Exchanges	35
Select Committee on Lobbying Activities	37
Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals, Pesticides, and Insecticides In and With Respect to Food Products.....	38
Select Committee To Investigate Abuses in Education, Training, and Loan Guaranty Programs of World War II Veterans.....	40
Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Katyn Forest Massacre.....	41
Select Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations and Other Organizations.....	42
Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of Offensive and Undesirable Books, Magazines, and Comic Books.....	44
Select Committee To Investigate Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R. (also known as Select Committee on Communist Aggression).....	45
Select Committee To Investigate and Study Certain Benefits for Surviving Dependents of Deceased Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces	47
Select Committee To Investigate and Study the Financial Position of the White County Bridge Commission.....	48
Select Committee on the House Recording Studio.....	49
Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration	50
Select Committee To Investigate and Study the Administration of the Export Control Act of 1949	51
Select Committee To Investigate Expenditures for Research Programs Conducted by or Sponsored by the Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government (also known as the Select Committee on Government Research)	53
Select Committee To Study the Factors Relating to the General Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages.....	54
Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.....	55

Appendix III—Continued

Select committees of the U.S. House of Representatives—Continued

Special Committee To Report to the House Upon the Question of the Right of Adam Clayton Powell To Be Sworn In as a Representative From the State of New York in the 90th Congress.....	Page 57
Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop.....	58
Select Committee To Regulate Parking on the House Side of the Capitol.....	59
Select Committee on Crime	60
Select Committee on the House Restaurant	62
Select Committee To Investigate All Aspects of United States Mili- tary Involvement in Southeast Asia	63
Select Committee on Committees.....	64
Select Committee on Aging	66
Select Committee on Intelligence.....	68
Ad Hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf.....	71
Select Committee To Study the Problem of United States Servicemen Missing in Action in Southeast Asia.....	73
Select Committee on Professional Sports.....	74
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control	76
Select Committee To Investigate the Circumstances Surrounding the Death of John F. Kennedy and the Death of Martin Luther King (also known as the Select Committee on Assassinations)	77
Select Committee on Ethics.....	80
Select Committee on Congressional Operations	82
Ad Hoc Committee on Energy	85
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.....	86
Select Committee on Population.....	89
Select Committee on Committees.....	91
Select Committee on Outer Continental Shelf.....	93
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families	94
Selected information on Select Committees of the U.S. House of Repre- sentatives: 1947-82	98

INTRODUCTION

On October 31, 1977, the Subcommittee on the Rules and Organization of the House of Representatives issued its report entitled *Guidelines for the Establishment of Select Committees*. This second printing amends that report to include actions of the House of Representatives relating to select committees through the 97th Congress. No changes are made in the recommendations and criteria set forth in the original report.

In its report, the Subcommittee on the Rules and Organization of the House presented six recommended criteria for use in reviewing proposals to create select committees. These criteria are:

1. The proposed select committee must deal with a significant and major issue.
2. The present committee system does not address the issue effectively.
3. The subject matter and the objectives of the proposed select committee must be clearly defined.
4. The method of inquiry and expected products of the select committee must be clearly stated.
5. A definite length of time for the proposed select committee to exist must be specified.
6. Cost factors involved in the creation of a select committee must be outlined.

In addition, the report contains three appendices:

Appendix I.—Model Resolution—The subcommittee notes that select committees are controlled almost exclusively by their organic resolutions and has, for that reason, provided a model resolution which would assure compliance with most of the standards proposed by this report.

Appendix II.—Questionnaire—The subcommittee feels that there is a minimum threshold of information which sponsors of these resolutions should provide before the Subcommittee can undertake a sensible review of the proposal and has provided a list of questions it would expect the principal sponsor to address in requesting hearings.

Appendix III.—Historical Review and Digest of Select Committee Resolution, 1947-82—While the nature of subcommittees and the reasons for their creation have varied enormously over the years, the subcommittee has considered it helpful to include a historical review of select committees. Included in appendix III is a digest of the resolutions creating select committees passed by the House since the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEES

The Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House recognizes that special circumstances sometimes justify the creation of select committees. In general, however, the proliferation of such committees adds to spiralling congressional costs, exacerbates already serious space problems, imposes additional committee burdens on Members, and may interfere with the effectiveness of the standing committee system.

For these reasons the subcommittee hereafter will apply the following criteria in considering proposals to create new select committees. The subcommittee expects to consider resolutions creating select committees and favorably report them to the full Committee on Rules only when such resolutions clearly reflect the intent and purpose of the following guidelines.

1. The proposed select committee must deal with a significant and major issue

Select committees should be created to focus on significant issues. The need for immediate and timely study of the issue should be the subject of general consensus. The proponents of the select committee should present to the Rules Committee substantial and well-documented evidence of the pressing need for establishing a select committee.

Among the items the Subcommittee will include in its evaluation of the need for a proposed select committee are: The number of cosponsors of a resolution to create a select committee; statements from party leaders and groups; recommendations from the President, Senate leaders, and other officials; petitions from outside organizations; press and media coverage of the issue.

There are certain commemorative or ceremonial occasions which may justify the creation of a select committee, permitting formal participation by the House as an institution in certain events. The Subcommittee acknowledges this special need and will give it due consideration in reviewing proposals to create select committees.

2. The present committee system does not address the issue effectively

Existing standing committees may fail to take up a significant issue for a number of reasons. A standing committee may have a heavily committed calendar of business, or lack the staff resources for additional inquiries, or lack sufficient interest to focus on the topic.

Jurisdiction over the subject matter may be so fragmented or overlapping that no single committee has a clearly established leading jurisdictional authority. In such cases, creation of a select committee may reduce controversy as to jurisdiction among competing committees.

Furthermore, a select committee may permit a broad perspective not available through any one standing committee with a portion of jurisdiction. The development of a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the issue may only be possible through a select committee. In such cases, a select committee may facilitate the development of a legislative package and help to insure House action on priority issues within a reasonable and specified time frame.

Circumstances from time to time may require a "blue-ribbon" panel to investigate a matter of great public concern. Certain issues may demand a careful and balanced representation of regional or other interests.

The subcommittee will include such factors in its evaluation of select committee proposals. It will also solicit the views of the standing committees with jurisdiction over the issue and will be disinclined to recommend creation of a select committee over significant opposition by a standing committee with jurisdiction.

3. The subject matter and the objectives of the proposed select committee must be clearly defined

The proponents of a select committee must clearly outline the proposed area of subject matter and the objectives of the select committee. They must also clearly define the boundaries of the proposed study. The subcommittee considers a narrowly defined proposal a more desirable and appropriate basis for the creation of a select committee.

4. Method of inquiry and expected products of the proposed select committee must be clearly stated

The subcommittee expects the sponsors of a resolution to create a select committee to outline the proposed method of inquiry into the subject matter. The subcommittee also expects the sponsors to state the form the select committee's findings will take and what reports, draft legislation, and other documents are to be produced. The Subcommittee believes that only in rare circumstances should a select committee have legislative authority.

The proponents of a select committee must state when they expect to submit their report and to whom they propose to report. The Subcommittee believes that, in general, a select committee should report not only to the House but also to the standing committees with jurisdiction over the area of inquiry.

If possible, the advocates of a select committee should inform the Rules Committee how the select committee's recommendations should be implemented—for example, public law, informal administrative action, executive reorganization, or revision of Federal regulations.

A discussion of these aspects of a select committee's projected activity will help determine whether or not establishment of the select committee will serve the lawmaking, oversight and investigatory responsibilities of the House.

5. A definite length of time for the proposed select committee to exist must be specified

The subcommittee believes that select committees should be created for limited periods of time. Select committees seeking reau-

thorization must be prepared to justify the extension of their authority, outline their planned future activities, explain why standing committees cannot handle the work, and state their additional time and budgetary requirements.

6. Cost factors involved in the creation of a select committee must be outlined

The proponents of a select committee must present to the Rules Committee a proposed outline of costs to be incurred and staffing requirements. The subcommittee believes that costs should be held to an absolute minimum by select committees. Expenditures may be held down by utilizing the staff resources of the legislative support agencies, the services of other Capitol Hill staff, and employees "borrowed" from appropriate Federal agencies when suitable and available.

APPENDIX I

MODEL RESOLUTION

The Rules of the House of Representatives require that Select Committees be appointed by the Speaker but contain no other specific references to select committees. There is a body of precedents which provide some guidance but, in general, select committees have only those powers and restrictions which are established by their organic resolutions.

The Subcommittee, therefore, has considered it appropriate to provide a model resolution which meets the criteria established through its study. The Subcommittee feels that the organic resolutions should result in as little variation as possible in the operation of select committees.

Failure to follow the format proposed in this appendix will have no effect on the Subcommittee's decision to act on resolutions referred to it; the Subcommittee wishes to protect the right of any Member to propose a select committee in whatever form he or she chooses. But the policy reasons for shaping the inquiry in a different manner would be a consideration in the Subcommittee's hearings and markup.

The following resolution is included as a model (a discussion of the implications of this format follows the text):

H. RES. —

Resolved, That there is hereby established in the House of Representatives a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on _____ (hereinafter referred to as the "select committee").

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 2. The select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of—

- (1) ;
- (2) ;
- (3) ;

APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall be composed of — Members of the House, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Members" shall mean any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) For purposes of carrying out this resolution the select committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, [or elsewhere,] whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives [, except the provisions of clause 2(m) relating to subpoena powers,] shall apply to the select committee.

(c) Nothing contained in paragraph (a) of this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of clause 2(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the select committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the adoption of expenses resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the select committee may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this resolution.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this resolution, the select committee, is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(3) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate which does not exceed the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of Title 5, United States Code;

(4) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and,

(5) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee, or a subcommittee thereof, held in the District of Columbia.

(c) The select committee and all authority granted in this resolution shall expire thirty days after the filing of the report of the select committee with the House [or just prior to noon on January 3, 19—, whichever occurs first].

REPORT AND RECORDS

SEC. 6. (a) The select committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress [, but not later than ————, 19—,] the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

[(c) Any such report shall be referred to the committee or committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof.

(d) The records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred to the Clerk of the House: *Provided, however, That*, if the report of the select committee is referred to only one committee under the provisions of paragraph (c), the records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred instead to the committee to which the final report is referred.]

SUMMARY OF MODEL RESOLUTION

Section 1.—While it is possible to provide for “a select committee to study and investigate ————,” the Subcommittee feels that the actual name of a select committee should be established in its organic resolution.

Section 2.—The heart of any resolution to establish a select committee is the investigating clause. Rulings of the Chair and by the courts on proposed investigations, subpoenas, or other actions by select committees have always rested most heavily on the specific language of the clause. The Subcommittee is concerned that resolutions should spell out the scope of proposed inquiries with as much clarity as possible.

Section 3.—In setting the size of proposed select committees, the Subcommittee recommends that a number which can be allotted in compliance with party ratios be used. In the case of select committees for which a different ratio might be desirable, the specific allotment should be stated.

Without paragraph (c), the Speaker is barred from appointing the Delegate and Resident Commissioners to select committees. The failure to make them eligible for appointment in some prior resolutions has been a simple oversight and the Subcommittee recommends that they be eligible for appointment in all cases.

Section 4.—Rule XI embodies all of the procedural reforms of recent years designed to guarantee the rights of ideological and party minorities in committee and to protect the right of the public and press to the fullest possible access to the legislative process. Without reference in its organic resolution, rule XI is not applicable to select committees. The Subcommittee recommends that the rule be made binding on all select committees. Subpoena power is conferred by deleting the language of section 4(c) inserted in brackets.

Restrictions on travel or the establishment of subcommittees, if desirable, would be inserted in this section.

Section 5.—The Subcommittee recommends language which insures that the operation of select committees will conform, as closely as possible, to the procedures of standing committees. The Subcommittee also recommends that a specific expiration date be established for select committees (see section 6); when this is done, it is necessary to insure that the select committee be able to have a reasonable period of time to close out its business. As a general rule, the Subcommittee is recommending 30 days but recognizes that shorter or longer periods may be desirable in certain cases.

Section 6.—The Subcommittee recommends that resolutions to establish select committees should contain an expiration date. In the absence of a specific date, the precedents are clear that a select committee expires with the Congress that establishes it. The Subcommittee recognizes that there will be occasions when it is appropriate for a select committee to continue throughout a Congress but, as a general rule, thinks that an expiration date should be included. Unless there is a prior understanding regarding the timetable for action by the Committee on Rules and the full House, however, it may be desirable to set the deadline in the form, “—months after adoption of this resolution.”

While not appropriate to all resolutions, the language in brackets [paragraphs (c) and (d)], may be useful to emphasize the jurisdiction of standing committees. This would be particularly true when the subject matter of a select committee was primarily within the jurisdiction of a single standing committee.

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

The Subcommittee is concerned about the amount of information available to the Committee on Rules in considering resolutions to establish select committees.

If a Member wishes to propose the establishment of an entity within the executive branch, congressional committees can solicit the views and judgment of the Office of Management and Budget and those agencies already involved in that area as well as the judgment of members and committees.

A proposal to establish an entity within the House of Representatives of a similar nature, however, leaves the Committee on Rules with a relatively narrow information base. The subcommittee, therefore, suggests that a large responsibility lies on the shoulders of the principal sponsors of resolutions to establish select committees.

While no firm rule is suggested, the subcommittee feels that generally no action should be taken on a resolution to establish a select committee until the principal sponsor has written to the chairman of the subcommittee or full committee to request action and has provided the committee with the fullest possible discussion of the following questions:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AUTHOR OF PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE

1. What is the current number of Members cosponsoring the resolution?
2. Will the proposed select committee address an issue of importance to the Nation or to the House as an institution? Please explain.
3. What standing committees may have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the proposed select committee and what portion of such standing committee/subcommittee jurisdiction will the proposed select committee include in its jurisdictional authority?
4. What justification exists for the subject to be investigated by a select committee instead of by one or more of the standing committees?
5. Will the conclusions and recommendations of the proposed select committee have a legislative purpose? Please explain.
6. Is the subject one that can be conclusively studied by the proposed select committee within one Congress? Please furnish an estimate of the time desired.
7. Will the proposed select committee require the power to subpoena witnesses and/or documents? If so, who may administer oaths? Please explain.

8. What number and type of staffing is anticipated for the proposed select committee (e.g., borrowed from other legislative committees or from Federal agencies, newly employed, professional-clerical ratio, experts and consultants, majority-minority ratio, and limits on compensation)?

9. What type of travel is anticipated (domestic and/or overseas)? If overseas travel is anticipated, what is the justification for granting such authority?

10. What is the estimate of total cost for the operation of the proposed select committee?

APPENDIX III

HISTORICAL REVIEW AND DIGEST OF SELECT COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS, 1947-82

The subcommittee in its study of the needs of the House of Representatives for select committees has reviewed the development of House select committees from an historical perspective. A brief historical review of this development follows.

The subcommittee has emphasized in its study the more recent development of select committees in the House of Representatives, focusing on select committees created since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Abstracts of the resolutions to create select committees which have passed the House since 1946 have been prepared for reference and follow the historical review. There is also a chart listing the select committees and comparing their features.

SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Historical context

The committee system of the House of Representatives developed gradually after the First Congress convened in 1789. Initially, most legislative business was transacted in the Committee of the Whole. Measures were first debated, and the policy of the House determined by all Members meeting in the Committee of the Whole, before being referred to select committees which were created anew for each bill. Under these circumstances, the committees of the House often did little more than recast decisions already made by the House into final legislative form.¹ In his study of the development of House committees, Joseph Cooper concludes that "the propositions establishing the tariff and the executive departments were elaborated at such length in the Committee of the Whole that the task of the select committees appointed to draw up the bills became mainly clerical."²

According to Lauros McConachie, the respective roles of select committees and the Committee of the Whole became a matter of controversy between the nascent political parties during the first several Congresses. One advocate of reliance on the Committee of the Whole was James Madison, who argued that "there could be only two reasons for referring on any occasion to a select commit-

¹ Alexander, DeAlva Stearnwood. *History and Procedure of the House of Representatives*, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co. (1916) p. 256.

² Cooper, Joseph. *The Origins of the Standing Committees and the Development of the Modern House* (Rice University Studies; v. 56, n. 3; Summer, 1970). Houston, William Marsh Rice University (1970) p. 9.

tee, either where there was an absolute want of time for the House to digest the subject themselves, or when any particular papers or documents were to be examined."³ But as the legislative agenda expanded and unfamiliar issues arose in the House, these conditions were met with increasing frequency, with the result that a more balanced division of labor rapidly evolved.

By the Fourth Congress (1795-97) the following propositions seem to have won general acceptance: that principles, not details, should be discussed when a subject was first referred to a Committee of the Whole; that matters of importance had prior claim on the Committee of the Whole with matters of routine being first referred there only if sufficient time existed and facts were clear or established; that subjects which were excessively complicated or detailed might first be referred to smaller committees for the arrangement or systematization of their features; and that subjects in which the facts could not adequately or conveniently be established by the members through their own investigations and discussions ought first to be investigated by a smaller committee.⁴

During the first decades of the 19th Century, the balance continued to shift in favor of initial consideration of bills in committee. Again according to McConachie,⁵

Thirty years after the above attempt of Madison to set narrow bounds for small committees, Webster felt called upon to inquire what subjects *need not be intrusted to them*, and concluded that they were "general propositions or general measures in regard to which no investigation as to facts and as to particulars might probably become necessary." From the position of the body whose work had been reviewed by small committees, the Whole—and with it the House, since they were identical—had itself become reviewer. Command had given place to control; authorship, to criticism. Somewhere in the interval between these two statesmen the turning-point had been passed which marked the transfer of the larger part of the business of Congress into its committee rooms. [Emphasis in original.]

Accompanying this development was the evolution of standing committees from select committees. With the emergence of routine and repetitive business, standing committees were established in lieu of select committees named to consider only one bill.

Very naturally two or three of those persistent Revolutionary claims or petitions coming in on the same day would in the First and Second Congresses be referred to one committee, so saving the trouble and time of constituting two or three. Very naturally, also, certain men surpassing others in dealing with this kind of work got their names familiar in the raising of select committees on claims. The duration of some committees gradually lengthened, and the positions of the able men became more secure. In this way came the standing Committees on Claims in the Third Congress. In this way, generally, standing committees have grown out of select committees.⁶

Cooper concludes that,⁷

Standing committees could be and were established in routine areas of policy that regularly provided topics of business (for example, claims) or in recurrent areas of major policy in which facts were typically so complex as to require extensive investigation and/or details so elaborate as to require prior arrangement (for example, ways and means). Select committees could be used to handle more erratic or irregular subjects of both major and minor importance as well as matters thought to be so important as to require handling by special committees instead of the standing committees within whose jurisdiction they belonged.

³ McConachie, Lauros G. *Congressional Committees*. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell (1898) p. 96.

⁴ Cooper, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵ McConachie, op. cit., p. 97.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 132-133.

⁷ Cooper, op. cit., p. 11.

Once the first standing committees had been established, however, Members gradually became convinced that they were the most appropriate forums for the development of legislation. For example, during debate in the 9th Congress on whether to establish a standing Committee on Public Lands, it was asserted,⁸

that the business of the House would, on this point, be greatly facilitated by the institution of a standing committee, whose decisions would be uniform, who would from long experience become more enlightened than a select committee, and who would be enabled to dispatch the business confided to them with great celerity.

As such arguments won general acceptance, the importance of select committees in the legislative process declined steadily. By the 23d Congress (1833-35), more than 30 standing committees had been established; by contrast, there were only 35 select committees during the 23d Congress as compared with the 350 such committees which had been named during the 3d Congress, 40 years earlier.⁹ Thirteen years after Woodrow Wilson wrote that "it is not far from the truth to say that Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work,"¹⁰ McConachie observed that select committees "recall passing events which have stirred the Nation for a moment, and then passed into the category of the forgotten."¹¹

Since the system of standing House committees matured during the 19th century, select committees often have been established for investigative as well as legislative purposes. As early as 1872, a select committee was created to inquire into the defeat of General St. Clair during an Indian campaign—an investigation which provoked questions of congressional access to executive branch papers that continue to arise to this day. Leonard White concludes that "in the decade from 1815 to 1825 the power to investigate became well fixed as an important means by which Congress discharged its duty of supervising the conduct of administration."¹² Although some investigations were conducted by standing committees, select committees were established with increasing frequency for this purpose. During the period 1929-61, 32 of the 36 investigations identified by George Galloway were performed by select committees.¹³

During the Civil War, select committees were directed by the House to investigate such matters as Government contracts, the defenses of the Great Lakes, emancipation, immigration, the confiscation of rebel property, the Pacific Railroad, the railroad from New York to Washington, and charges against the Commissioner of Patents. A joint select committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Benjamin Wade of Ohio, also conducted extensive inquiries into the conduct of the war. Later, allegations of scandal during the Grant administration inspired a series of investigations; two House select

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁹ Adapted from Galloway, George B. *Congress at the Crossroads*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell (1946), pp. 88-89.

¹⁰ Wilson, Woodrow. *Congressional Government*, New York, World Publishing Co. (1885); Gloucester, Peter Smith Publishing Co. (1965), p. 69.

¹¹ McConachie, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹² White, Leonard D. *The Jeffersonians*. New York, The Macmillan Co. (1951) p. 100.

¹³ Galloway, George B. *History of the House of Representatives*. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell (1961), p. 181.

committees were created solely to investigate the Credit Mobilier affair of 1872-73.

Between 1885 and 1946, according to Galloway, 17 investigations of the executive branch were conducted by select committees of the House, as follows: ¹⁴

Administration of Government Printing Office—50th Congress (1887-89).
 Reform in the civil service—50th-52d Congresses (1887-93).
 Soldier's Home in Leavenworth, Kansas—54th Congress (1895-97).
 Purchase of the Danish West Indies—57th Congress (1901-03).
 Prevention of fraud in public service—60th Congress (1907-09).
 Operation of U.S. Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation—66th Congress (1919-21).
 Contracts and expenditures by War Department—66th Congress (1919-21).
 Operations of U.S. Air Service—68th Congress (1923-25).
 Shipping Board—69th Congress (1925-27).
 Government organization—76th Congress (1939-41).
 National Labor Relations Board—76th Congress (1939-41).
 Acts of Executive Agencies beyond scope of their authority—78th and 79th Congresses (1943-46).
 Seizure of Montgomery Ward and Co.—78th Congress (1943-44).
 Federal Communications Commission—78th Congress (1943-44).
 National Defense program in re small business—78th Congress (1943-44).
 Postwar military policy—78th and 79th Congresses (1943-46).
 Disposition of surplus property—79th Congress (1945-46).

During the same periods, select committees were also created on such subjects as the census, the Federal budget, water power, conservation of wildlife resources, un-American Activities, campaign expenditures, post-war economic policy and planning, food shortages, the interstate migration of destitute citizens, and reconstruction of the House roof and skylights.

The extraordinary powers exercised by the President and other executive branch officials during World War II stimulate even greater investigatory activities by both standing and select committees of the House and the Senate. Roland Young concludes that: ¹⁵

The proliferation of investigation committees was one of the singular characteristics of the war Congress. The emphasis on investigation, on the control of policy after the passage of an Act, was a spontaneous congressional reaction, as it were, to the increasing number of activities with which the administrative branch was concerned. At the beginning of the war, the major investigation committees were the Truman Committee (Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program), which was interested in questions relating to production; the Tolan Committee (House Committee on Inter-State Migration), which broadened its activities from migratory labor to include also general problems relating to the organization of production; the Murray and Patman Committees (Senate and House Committees on Small Business); the Maloney Committee (Senate Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel-Oil Shortages), and the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs and on Naval Affairs. There was considerable overlapping of committee interests inasmuch as jurisdictions were concerned with such controversial subjects as rubber production; manpower policy was considered by the Labor Committee as well as by the Military Affairs, Appropriations, Judiciary, and Agricultural Committees, and by the Truman and Tolan Committees.

It was in this context that the Congress established the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in February, 1945, and directed the Joint Committee to "make a full and complete study

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

¹⁵ Young, Roland. *Congressional Politics in the Second World War*. New York, Columbia University Press (1956) p.19. Neither Galloway nor Young provide criteria for distinguishing between "investigation committees" and other House committees, a distinction which can be difficult to make and even more difficult to apply in particular cases.

of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States," including "the structure of, and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress."¹⁶ Under the cochairmanship of Senator La Follette of Wisconsin and Representative Monroney of Oklahoma, the Joint Committee held extensive hearings, and, in the following March, recommended a major reorganization and consolidation of House and Senate standing committees. Having urged that "the jurisdiction of each reorganized committee be clearly defined so that overlapping and duplication will be eliminated" and that "the standing committees of both Houses be directed and empowered to carry on continuing review and oversight of legislation and agencies within their jurisdiction", the Joint Committee also recommended that "the practice of creating special investigating committees be abandoned":¹⁷

Directing the regular standing committees to carry on this supervisory function appeals to your committee as a better method than the appointment of numerous select investigating committees when situations have grown so difficult as to arouse public demand for correction of special study. We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned.

Although not made explicit in the Joint Committees's final report, its emphasis on clarifying committees' legislative jurisdictions also indicates that the Joint Committee did not anticipate any future need for select committees with legislative, as opposed to primarily investigative, responsibilities.

The reasoning underlying the Joint Committee's proposal to eliminate select committees was probably expressed in the following exchange between its Vice Chairman, Representative Monroney, and Representative Ramspeck of Georgia during hearings on April 17, 1945:¹⁸

THE VICE CHAIRMAN. Do you think this rash of special investigation committees that has broken out in the last year or two is an illustration of the break-down of the regular standing committee structure in its ability to carry on the work, and because of the lack of realignment of committees, and because of improper staffing, the House has been in a violent struggle to keep up with its work load and they have created new special committees to do jobs which the regular committees should be equipped to handle?

MR RAMSPECK. Yes, that is certainly one of the reasons for it. Of course, there may be others, but that is certainly one of the reasons, because if the standing committees did their job there would not be any necessity for these special committees.

Most of the standing committees are not equipped to do a real job, and it is much easier, the Members have found, to get a special committee and get some money to employ a staff to do a job. That is one of the reasons, I think, why we have special committees.

Several years later, Senator La Follette testified that the Joint Committee had urged that select committees be abolished "because we felt that if a special investigation were necessary, it ought to be made in an orderly procedure by the committee which ultimately

¹⁶ H. Con. Res. 18, 79th Congress, 1st session; adopted on Feb. 19, 1945.

¹⁷ U.S. Congress. Senate. Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Report. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946 (79th Congress, 2d Session, Senate, Report n. 1011), pp. 5-6.

¹⁸ U.S. Congress. Senate. Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Hearings, 79th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945, pp.301-302.

would have to consider any legislative remedies necessary to meet any situations which developed as a result of these inquiries.¹⁹

When the Senate acted on the Joint Committee's recommendation by passing S. 2177, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the prohibition against special or select committees was included as Section 126:²⁰

No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution to establish or to continue a special or select committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

However, this provision was not included in the bill as passed by the House or in the Act as finally signed into law. Nevertheless, during the following few years, both Representative Monroney and George Galloway, the Joint Committee's staff director, asserted the "the spirit of the 1946 act clearly frowns on the creation of special committees * * *."²¹

Select Committees of the House Since 1946

During the following few years, this "spirit" of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was evoked in opposition to the creation of several new select committees. For example, in February, 1947, the House considered H. Res. 58, creating a select committee to investigate the adequacy of current supplies of newsprint and other paper products. During debate on the resolution, Rep. Monroney offered his interpretation of the 1946 Act, as it pertained to select committees:²²

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to see us here today take our first backward step in an effort to destroy a very carefully worked out, improved standing committee system for the Congress. By adopting this resolution today we are taking that first step and I fear that we will go back, back to the same old duplicating, crazy-quilt, confusing, tanglefoot committee system which the Congress left only about 45 days ago.

The keystone of the reorganization of the Congress was to strengthen the standing committee structure where 90 percent of our work is done. It was an effort to get away from this crazy-quilt committee pattern by cutting the standing committees down from 48 to 19.

We were applauded by the country for the improvement of our committee structure.

It is true that when the bill came before the Congress we did not have a prohibition against special committees. That was compromised at that time. I did not feel badly for compromising it then because I felt that the jurisdiction to establish special committees still lay within the will of the House at any time to create or not to create a special committee. So I felt that regardless of which party was in power, and particularly if my own party was in power, we would be able to hold to reorganization and to decline to go backward to the old hopeless morass of overlapping standing and special committees.

Rep. Monroney also noted that the newsprint investigation had been conducted previously by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and asserted that the proposed select committee was being established primarily to suit the convenience of several Members who no longer served on that stand-

¹⁹ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Hearings, 80th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1948, p. 77.

²⁰ Congressional Record. v. 92, June 6, 1946, p. 6367.

²¹ Galloway, George B. The Legislative Process in Congress. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell (1953) p. 306. The same sentiment had been expressed earlier by Representative Monroney : Congressional Record. v. 93, Feb. 21, 1947, p. 1320.

²² Congressional Record. v. 93, Feb. 26, 1947, p. 1461.

ing committee. In response, Reps. Halleck of Indiana and Smith of Virginia both pointed out that the Reorganization Act had required many Members to sacrifice standing committee assignments, and that, in this instance, a select committee was an appropriate means to ensure that the inquiry would be continued by Members already familiar with it.

Moreover, Rep. Halleck disagreed with Rep. Monroney's understanding of the "spirit" of the 1946 Act. During a colloquy between these two Members several days before the House took up H. Res. 58, Rep. Halleck stated that:²³

He says that the setting up of a special committee is not in violation of the letter of the Reorganization Act, which is, of course, true and correct. That has not been so represented by some persons who have undertaken to speak about this matter of special committees. Beyond that I cannot agree with the gentleman as to what he calls the spirit of the Act. As I have asserted on previous occasions, and as the gentleman knows, when the Reorganization Act was formulated and presented, it contained a firm prohibition against the setting up of any special committees. However, that provision was taken out and is not now in the law. As I have heretofore asserted, that can give rise to no assumption other than that the right was reserved in the spirit and in the letter of the law to create special committees if for any reason they would be deemed to be desirable.

The intent of the 1946 Act may have become the subject of debate in part because the Senate provision banning select committees was never presented to the House for its consideration and decision. During debate on H. Res. 58, Rep. Dirksen of Illinois recalled how this provision had come to be deleted from the House version of the Act:²⁴

Mr. Speaker, every so often it becomes necessary to write an explanatory footnote to history. That is my only purpose today.

When the Reorganization Act passed the Senate and came over to our committee, I was a member of the joint committee and labored shoulder to shoulder with our good friend from Oklahoma. Moreover, I commend his devotion to the Reorganization Act and the zeal with which he defends it. It became necessary to get clearance of that bill from the leadership. In early July we sat in the Speaker's office. The distinguished former Speaker of the House was there. The present distinguished Speaker of the House was there. The Parliamentarian also participated in that conference, along with the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself, and that very able and estimable Member, former Majority Leader McCormack. Then the Speaker of the House objected to one item in the bill and, if he does not mind my affectionate allusion to him, I said, "Sam, what you are referring to now is my pet baby and I do not want it taken out." He said, "It cannot remain in the bill because I have had experience with that matter and it must come out." So it came out.

The present distinguished occupant of the Speaker's chair said, "You have a provision there under which we could create no select or special committees." Being farseeing, and, of course, seeing down the corridor to 1948, knowing what was going to happen, knowing the necessity for looking at a good many things in government where there was misfeasance and maladministration, he said, "That must come out."

So we discussed the matter there very freely, and, as a result, it did come out. It must be said as a footnote to history, in the interest of Speaker Joe Martin, that he insisted it come out and it came out. There was therefore a perfect understanding that the authority to create special or select committees was preserved and there was reason to believe that such committees would be established.

As a consequence, the subpoena power was left in the standing committees of the Senate and was taken away from the standing committees of the House for the very purpose of having select committees in addition thereto. When the bill finally came

²³ Congressional Record v. 93, Feb. 21, 1947, p. 1320.

²⁴ Congressional Record, v. 93, Feb. 26, 1947, p. 1464. The intent of the Senate may well have been different, even though it accepted the House amendments to the Act. See the remarks of Senator Frear of Delaware: Congressional Record, v. 95, Aug. 31, 1949, pp. 12590-12597.

to the floor of the House there was written in it, before you passed on the bill, a provision on page 13 which reads as follows:

"The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time."

Is anything necessary to make it plainer that we had in contemplation the creation of select committees, irrespective of the subject matter that was going to come within the purview of that committee? The Speaker had it in mind and in consequence we violate neither the tradition nor the spirit of the Reorganization Act when a committee of this kind is created.

On several other occasions, Members reiterated the argument that select committees contributed to the fragmentation of the House committee system and were, therefore, contrary to the goal which the Congress sought to achieve by consolidating its standing committees in 1946. Rep. Monroney repeated his contention later in 1947, during debate on the resolution creating the Select Committee to Investigate Transactions on Commodity Exchanges. Two years later, Rep. Holifield of California expressed the same concern with regard to the proposed Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, although he also voiced his support for the resolution. And in 1950, Rep. Hoffman objected to another proposed select committee by stating that:²⁵

Mr. Speaker, with reference to this particular resolution, it was my understanding that when the reorganization bill was passed we were to do away, to some extent, with special committees to investigate various matters. I cannot see why the jurisdiction for this investigation does not come within the purview of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. So much for that.

As Rep. Hoffman's statement suggests, this argument did not prevail within the House and, although references to the 1946 Act continued to be made, no extended debates recurred on the principle of creating select committees to complement the standing committee system.

Since passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House has established more than thirty different select or special committees, a number of which were re-created during one or more subsequent Congresses. In general, such committees have been created for one of four purposes: (1) To investigate conditions or events about which allegations have been made; (2) to study and report on matters with a view toward subsequent legislative action by standing committees; (3) to report to the House on the merits of specific legislative proposals and to encourage coordinated legislative decisions; and (4) to supervise certain routine housekeeping functions.

Several select investigative committees were established during the early years of the Cold War when the dangers of Soviet aggression and subversion were of prime national concern. For example, during the 82d Congress, a select committee was appointed to investigate the circumstances surrounding the Katyn Forest massacre of more than 15,000 Polish officers during World War II, and particularly to determine if the Soviet Union should be held responsible. During the same Congress, a second select committee was created to examine the activities of tax exempt foundations and to explore whether any such foundations had been subsidizing un-American activities. In 1953, another select committee investi-

²⁵ Congressional Record. v. 96, Aug. 28, 1950, p. 13630.

gated Soviet aggression in the Baltic region and in other nations of Eastern Europe.

Select committees have also been created for other investigative purposes. At the beginning of this period, a select committee was established in reponse to allegations that confidential information about prospective Government purchases had been used improperly by Government employees to profit from speculation in commodity futures. The select committee with the most limited mandate was the 1955 Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Financial Position of the White County Bridge Commission, created to sponsor an audit of the commission which operated a federally authorized toll bridge between Illinois and Indiana. More recently, select investigative committees have inquired into the status of Americans missing in action in Southeast Asia and into the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The mandate of each of these select committees has been primarily investigative. Although the results of congressional investigations may stimulate remedial legislation, the debates on the resolutions establishing these committees did not emphasize the need for nor the expectation of legislative recommendations. A nonlegislative purpose of a select committee was expressed clearly in 1952, during debate on a resolution to expand the mandate and authority of the select committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacre. Rep. Gross of Iowa raised the question of the committee's purpose, asking, "If it is clearly demonstrated that the Russians carried out this massacre, what do we do about it then?" In reply, the Committee's chairman, Rep. Madden of Indiana, stated: ²⁶

I think we have accomplished a great deal in overcoming Russian propaganda behind the iron curtain. The enslaved people are learning the true facts, misrepresentation in Communist propaganda is being exposed. I have broadcasted regarding the evidence presented to this committee on four different occasions over the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have also talked on the Voice of America. I think this committee has contributed an avalanche of material already in overcoming Communist propaganda.

Similarly, Rep. Price of Illinois supported creation of the select committee to investigate Soviet aggression in the Baltic region as follows: ²⁷

As in the case of the Katyn Forest investigations by a congressional committee, I feel that when the criminal facts of the Communist aggression in these nations are brought to world attention it will be a very powerful psychological blow against communism.

The only way these Soviet atrocities in the martyred Baltic nations can be adequately brought to the attention of the United States and the world would be through hearings before a congressional committee such as this resolution proposes.

More than 20 years later, Rep. Downing of Virginia, the prospective chairman of the select committee to investigate the Kennedy and King assassinations, justified creation of that committee in equally nonlegislative terms: ²⁸

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go home and face my people unless I can assure them that I have done my utmost to provide them with the knowledge of what really happened to John F. Kennedy, their President. I want them to know what

²⁶ Congressional Record. v. 98, Mar. 11, 1952, p. 2106.

²⁷ Congressional Record. v. 99, July 27, 1953, pp. 10032-10033.

²⁸ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 122, Sept. 17, 1976, p. H10358.

happened to Dr. King. I want to be able to tell them that no one has stood in their way of learning the truth. I want to help restore in them the credibility of their government. That they need.

In most cases, the resolutions to create select investigative committees have been adopted without significant opposition being expressed on the House floor. On occasion, however, Members have expressed reservations, contending that investigative committees may become vehicles for the propagation of particular philosophies or points of view,²⁹ or that they may have only a tenuous connection at best with the Congress' legislative function. An illustration of the latter concern is an objection made by Rep. Stanley of Virginia to providing additional funds for the Katyn Forest investigation of 1951-52:³⁰

In the eyes of the rest of the world, and I refer particularly to the free nations, what possible jurisdiction does the Congress of the United States have over Russian atrocities committed against Polish nationals? Would not we be accused of meddling? There may be propaganda value in this investigation, and I do not doubt that there is, but what is our jurisdiction over these murders? It is like a court in California trying a murder case committed in Florida, when the murderer cannot be caught even if he is convicted.

During the 1950's, congressional investigations were the subject of several judicial decisions which imposed some requirements on their conduct and scope. In particular, the Supreme Court has ruled that investigations must be undertaken in furtherance of the Congress' constitutionally assigned functions. Only in connection with the Select Committee on Assassinations has this requirement been raised on the House Floor. During debate on the resolution to re-establish the Select Committee during the 95th Congress, Rep. Anderson of Illinois noted that its mandate had been expanded in order to give "the select committee a legislative purpose":³¹

This language says in effect that the select committee shall determine the adequacy of existing laws and agency enforcement efforts and cooperation with respect to the matters under investigation, and report back any proposals for change in present law or new legislation. This language is necessitated by numerous Supreme Court decisions that any congressional inquiry must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of Congress. And I cite here, *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957), and *Barenblatt v. United States*, 350 U.S. 109 (1959).

In short, without this language, the select committee's inquiry might be subject to a constitutional challenge.

In a number of other instances, select committees have been created by the House to inquire into certain events or situations but, unlike investigative committees, with the apparent expectation that their reports and recommendations likely would provide the basis for further House action. For example, during the 80th and 81st Congresses alone, select committees were established to inquire into the shortage of newsprint and other paper products, the need for and scope of foreign aid programs, the prevalence and health effects of chemicals in food and cosmetic products, the extent and means of lobbying activities, and the impact of programs for the education and training of World War II veterans.

²⁹ See Hamilton, Roy. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources: An Ethical and Rational Criticism. *Natural Resources Journal*, v. 2, no. 1, Apr., 1962: 45-54.

³⁰ Congressional Record. v. 98, Mar. 20, 1952, p. 2642.

³¹ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, Feb. 2, 1977, p. H792.

During more recent Congresses, such select committees have been established to study and report on export controls, Government research programs, Federal policies on aging, intelligence agencies and activities, professional sports, and narcotics and drug abuse. In each case, Members argued that deficiencies in Federal programs were strongly suspected or known to exist, or that the subject deserved a more thorough and comprehensive study than it had received and was likely to receive from the standing committees of the House. Although lacking the authority to report legislation to the House, these committees have usually been directed explicitly to assess the adequacy of existing laws and, if necessary, to make legislative recommendations for consideration by the appropriate standing committees.

Two unusual cases illustrate the range of purposes for which select committees have been created. On the day the 90th Congress convened in January, 1967, the House adopted H. Res. 1, establishing a special committee to make recommendations to the House regarding the seating of Representative-elect Adam Clayton Powell of New York. Although this committee proposed no new legislation, its recommendations did set the terms under which the Powell matter was debated by the House (although the action of the House was subsequently ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in *Powell v. McCormack*).³² Three years later, in 1970, another select committee was created to report within 45 days on the current status of hostilities in Southeast Asia—not to make recommendations for legislation, but to provide information on which each Member could base his or her own assessment of American policy. As these instances indicate, select committees have, on occasion, proven to be useful mechanisms for the House to cope with transitory matters or issues which the House has not wished to commit to one of its standing committees.

Most select committees have been authorized to make legislative recommendations but, until recently, few have been empowered to report legislation directly to the House. In 1954, a select committee was created to study and report on the benefits provided to dependents of deceased and former members of the armed services; but when this committee was re-created in 1955, it was authorized not only to make recommendations, but also "to prepare such legislation as it may consider appropriate to carry out such recommendations." In March 1958, the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration was also granted legislative authority, but only for a period of several months until the House established the standing Committee on Science and Astronautics.

During the 1970's, the House has granted legislative authority to its select committees more frequently, but the nature of the select committees themselves has also become more diverse. H. Res. 132 of the 93d Congress established the Select Committee on Committees to study the committee system of the House and to report to the House "by bill, resolution, or otherwise." Among the Committee's proposals were recommended procedures for the consideration of bills or issues which overlapped the jurisdictions of two or more

³² See Jacobs, Andy. *The Powell Affair*. Indianapolis and New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. (1973).

standing committees: split or sequential referral of bills and, alternatively, ad hoc committees, including members of the standing committees which would otherwise have jurisdiction. These proposals were incorporated into H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974.

Pursuant to this new authority, the House has created the ad hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf during both the 94th and 95th Congresses and an ad hoc Committee on Energy during the 95th Congress. Whereas the former was empowered to report bills directly to the House floor, the energy committee was created with the understanding that it would review the relevant legislation reported by standing committees and devise proposed amendments, as necessary, which would receive priority consideration on the floor.

Also during the 95th Congress, a Select Committee on Ethics has been established and authorized to report legislation to incorporate into law certain changes in House rules which had been adopted as parts of H. Res. 287, recommended by the Commission on Administrative Review. Finally, the House has also established a permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with exclusive legislative authority over the CIA and shared legislative authority over other intelligence agencies.³³

Finally, select committees have been created in several instances during the past two decades to supervise routine service functions for the House. In 1956, the Select Committee on the House Recording Studio was established as part of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1957. The Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop was created by House resolutions during the 90th and 91st Congress, and then given statutory form by the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970. Two additional select committees to supervise the House restaurant and to regulate House parking were first appointed during the 91st Congress and then re-created during the two following Congresses, after which their functions were assumed by subcommittees of the Committee on House Administration.

During debates on resolutions to establish select committees, Members of the House have frequently stressed the importance of the standing committee system, and their reluctance to take any action which might seem to undermine the existing committee structure except under the most extraordinary circumstances. Nonetheless, more than thirty different select committees have been created since 1947, and many more continue to be proposed each year.

An examination of these debates indicates that the most common and compelling argument in favor of establishing a select committee is the fragmentation of the standing committees' jurisdiction as they relate to the subject of the proposed select committee's inquiry. Advocates of a particular select committee have frequently noted that as many as six or more standing House committees

³³ Unlike other select committees, a permanent select committee is incorporated into the House Rules and continues from one Congress to the next in the same manner as do standing committees. Under the provision of rule X(6)(g), the Select Committee on Aging also enjoys this status.

have some jurisdictional interest in the matter in question, and that, consequently, it has either "fallen between the cracks" of the committee system or has not been subject to the kind of comprehensive assessment and review on which sound public policy should be based.

These contentions are illustrated by the following colloquy which took place in 1947, during debate on the resolution to create the Select Committee on Foreign Aid: ³⁴

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You may say that it is not necessary to have a select committee, yet there are at least half a dozen committees of this House, regular legislative committees, that are called upon at one time or another to exercise their judgment and to pass upon some facet, some particular angle, of this foreign aid problem. So it has been determined that it would be wise to authorize the Speaker to select a special committee, upon which all these various standing committees may have representation, to make an over-all study, not only of what demands may be made upon the United States in the future for foreign aid, but also as to the ability, if you please, of the United States to meet such demands.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the resolution provides for a very distinct need, may I say to the gentleman, because it has been my observation that this program of foreign aid and relief comes before the Congress after the country is committed, and comes before us piecemeal, a bit at a time, so that we have no overall view of the entire picture.

Am I correct in the assumption that those who sponsor this resolution have in mind that we shall as a result of the action of this committee obtain an over-all picture of what all of these demands may amount to in all fields and for all purposes so that the Congress may not be called upon to make these appropriations piecemeal, here and there, bite by bite?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly correct in his assumption. While I cannot answer for the Speaker, I believe I can say that in the information given to the Committee on Rules it was pointed out that various legislative committees dealing with this great problem, such as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Agriculture, and all the other great committees of the House which are in one way or another involved in the legislative processes that are necessary to put into operation any kind of foreign aid program, will be represented on this special committee and receive factual information from it.

Comparable arguments have been made in support of other proposed select committees: (1) That the matter which the select committee will study is of major and immediate national importance; (2) that it requires a comprehensive inquiry by Congress as a necessary precursor to legislation; (3) that the jurisdictional alignments of the standing committees are such that no one standing committee can examine the matter fully; and (4) that, therefore, a select committee is the most appropriate mechanism available in that its mandate and authority can be carefully drawn to conform with the requirements of its inquiry, and in that it can provide the House with the information it requires without encroaching on the established legislative prerogatives of the standing committees.

In other instances, select committees have been created to investigate matters which would otherwise have fallen within the jurisdiction of only one or two standing committees; but other arguments have been offered in support of a select committee inquiry.

For example, during the 1949 debate on establishing the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, Rep. Sabath of Illinois noted

³⁴ Congressional Record. v. 93, July 22, 1947, p. 9762.

that the inquiry could be conducted by the standing Committee on the Judiciary, but that it was too busy with other matters to give lobbying the attention it deserved.³⁵ Similarly, Rep. Monroney objected to creation of the Select Committee to Investigate Transactions on Commodity Exchanges, arguing that the investigation should be conducted instead by the standing Committee on Agriculture. However, Rep. Hope of Kansas, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, replied that the Committee "is very busy at this time" and that "if the committee should undertake an investigation of the scope and character that should be undertaken in this instance it might interfere seriously with this and other important legislative matters."³⁶ More than twenty years later, Rep. Randall of Missouri supported creation of the Select Committee on Crime by asserting that, although the Judiciary Committee had the authority to take up the subject, it had not acted and the House could wait no longer for a thorough examination of so important a subject.³⁷

One reason why some Members have believed that the inaction of standing committees has justified creation of select committees was expressed by Rep. Halleck of Indiana during debate on establishing the Select Committee on Newsprint in 1947:³⁸

We all know the standing committees of the House are organized primarily to consider pending legislation in their assigned fields. The Reorganization Act itself indicates that the jobs to be carried on by the legislative committees in the field of investigation shall be in considerable measure those jobs looking to the enactment of legislation. I do not know whether legislation will be proposed by this newsprint committee, but I would assume from my experience on the previous committee that it will not have much to do with legislation.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to which Halleck makes reference, had, for the first time, directed the Congress' standing committees to exercise "continuous watchfulness" over the administration of programs and agencies within their jurisdictions. A desire to improve the breadth and depth of congressional oversight was among the expressed goals of both the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. If, as Halleck implies, standing committees tend to concentrate on legislative matters or on investigations which are expected to lead to legislation, then select committees can serve as a useful supplement to the standing committee system as bodies with primarily and investigative or oversight mandate.

During the current Congress, select committees have also been advocated as coordinating mechanisms. The resolution creating the Select Committee on Energy specified that its membership should include members of the several standing committees with energy-related jurisdictions. Moreover, although this Select Committee was not expected to report legislation to the House, it was established with the expectation that it would review energy bills reported by the standing committees and propose amendments, for priority consideration on the floor, which would ensure that these individual bills combined to constitute a coordinated approach to

³⁵ Congressional Record. v. 95, Aug. 12, 1949, p. 11386. See also Waters, Bertram G. *The Politics of Hunger: Forming a Senate Select Committee*. Groennings, Sven and Jonathan P. Hawley. To Be a Congressman. Washington, Acropolis Books (1973): 151-167.

³⁶ Congressional Record. 1. 93, Dec. 18, 1947, p. 11643-11645.

³⁷ Congressional Record. v. 115, May 1, 1969, p. 11090.

³⁸ Congressional Record. v. 93, Feb. 26, 1947, p. 1463.

national energy policy. Also in 1977, the proposed permanent Select Committee on Intelligence was described by Rep. Bolling of Missouri as "basically a committee of the leadership." Including members of four named standing committees, "[i]ts membership will be appointed by the Speaker of his motion and on the recommendation of the minority leader."³⁹ As Bolling's statements indicate, the authority of the Speaker, pursuant to rule X(6)(e), to appoint all select committees (minority party members traditionally being appointed upon recommendation by the Minority Leader) creates the likelihood that select committees will be more sensitive and responsive to the policy positions prevalent within each party than would be expected of standing committees with established memberships.

As the above arguments in support of select committees might suggest, they have been opposed on occasion as constituting unreasonable and unnecessary incursions on the responsibilities and activities of the standing committees. For example, the proposed 1970 select committee to conduct a factfinding commission to Southeast Asia was criticized on the grounds that its study could be conducted more effectively and appropriately by members of the Armed Services or Foreign Affairs Committees which were already familiar with the military and diplomatic situations. In a similar fashion, Rep. Rodino of New Jersey objected to the re-creation of the Select Committee on Professional Sports in 1977, asserting that its proposed inquiry into the application of antitrust laws impinged on activities already in progress by the Committee on the Judiciary. Chairman Rodino's argument exemplifies the natural tension between select committees and the standing committees of jurisdiction:⁴⁰

The matters within the scope of the select committee's requested authority are all matters squarely within the rule X jurisdiction of existing standing committees of the House. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of the committee system is severely compromised if a select committee is created every time a new issue surfaces in the press. Oversight by standing committees becomes meaningless, the prospect of legislation becomes delayed, and the expertise nurtured and developed by the standing committees is squandered. At a time when the public expects a tightening of the belt and a heightened sense of congressional responsibility, I cannot imagine sanctioning the creation of a select committee to pursue matters within the jurisdiction of at least four standing committees of the House.

Related to this objection to select committees are the contentions that select committees distract their members from their standing committee assignments, and that select committees usually lack the authority to ensure that their recommendations are considered by the full House in legislative form. In this vein, the continuation of the Select Committee on Crime was opposed on the grounds that further studies and investigations were not needed, and that the House should proceed instead to consider legislation which could only be reported by its standing committees. The frequent practice of appointing to select committees representatives of the standing committees of jurisdiction promotes coordination, but by no means ensures that select committee recommendations will receive serious consideration as legislation.

³⁹ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, July 14, 1977, p. H7106.

⁴⁰ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, Mar. 7, 1977, p. H1762.

In addition to these arguments concerning the wisdom of creating select committees, several disagreements have arisen in recent years regarding their memberships and the procedures by which the House has considered the resolution creating them.

The Rules of the House provide that the Speaker shall appoint all members of select committees, and he has routinely designated one member of each such committee as its chairman. Of the 17 select committees created by the House between 1958 and 1976, 10 of them have been chaired by Members who had been among their principal sponsors and advocates. In a number of instances, the resolutions to establish select committees have specified that at least some of their members be appointed from among the memberships of the standing committees of jurisdiction.

For instance, the resolution creating the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control requires that it include members from each of seven named standing committees. In other cases, the same practice has been followed even in the absence of such a requirement. It seems reasonable to assume that this practice has had the effects of reducing opposition to creation of a select committee, ensuring that at least some members of a newly created select committee would already be reasonably well informed about the subject of its investigation or inquiry, and promoting the likelihood that a select committee's findings and recommendations would receive adequate and prompt consideration as legislation.

In most cases, also, the partisan division among select committee members has been roughly proportional to the partisan division within the House as a whole. Exceptions have been the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and the Select Committee on Committees, both of which included an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. The resolution creating the Select Committee on Committees was also exceptional in that it provided that funds for the Committee's staff and expenses should be available in equal amounts to the majority and minority party contingents. In support of these provisions, Rep. Bolling of Missouri described the discussions which had taken place among the party leaders and the members of the Rules Committee:⁴¹

We figured out that there was only one way of having any hope of succeeding in the end, and that was to have a most unusual committee, a completely bipartisan committee, and in the process we decided that the only way to make that very clear that that was meaningful—and although certainly we do not want to have two separate staffs—was to say in the resolution that the money would be available half-and-half, half to the majority and half to the minority. We were eliminating or hoping to eliminate all partisanship at the outset.

This is an impossible task—with the “impossible” in quotation marks—and we wanted to make it clear that this was being undertaken not to serve any party or any interest. That is the reason the committee is unique in that way.

The resolution also provided for the committee to receive the funds needed for its operation without reference to the Committee on House Administration in order to preclude either the appearance or the possibility of its deliberations being influenced by dependence on the support of a standing committee.

With this precedent in mind, several subsequent resolutions to create select committees have been criticized for not also specifying

⁴¹ Congressional Record. v. 119, Jan. 31, 1973, p. 2805.

bipartisan memberships. During debate on the proposed Select Committee on Ethics, Rep. Anderson of Illinois noted that both the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and the Select Committee on Committees had been composed of equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, and that the latter committee had recommended that the standing Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should also be bipartisan in its membership. He contended, therefore, that the Select Committee on Ethics should be constituted in the same manner.⁴²

Several months later, members of the minority party again advocated an equal partisan division during debate on creating the permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, culminating in the following colloquy between Reps. Bauman of Maryland and Bolling of Missouri:⁴³

Mr. BAUMAN. Because of the sensitive jurisdiction of this committee, why would it not be proper to establish the membership not on the basis of the actual numerical political division of the House, but rather, as the other body set the precedent, a much closer division, assuming the committee will be non-partisan in its future actions.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman also knows that matters of intelligence, unlike matters of organization and matters of ethics, involve policy. And it is only reasonable, in my opinion, while I expect the committee to be totally nonpartisan—that is the reason for the majority and minority leader being *ex officio* members—it is only reasonable for us to follow the mandate of the American people in our election to the House of Representatives on policy matters. And that is the reason the division would be as suggested.

On several recent occasions, objections have also been expressed to the fact that resolutions establishing select committees have been brought up as privileged resolutions by authority of the Committee on Rules under clause 4 of House rule XI. Consequently, most such resolutions have not been subject to floor amendment. During the 1950's and 1960's, this practice engendered little comment or criticism, but it has become a matter of some controversy during the current decade. And, in 1976 and 1977, the resolutions to create and then to re-create the Select Committee on Intelligence and to establish the Select Committees on MIA's and Assassinations were all subject to amendment either in the Committee of the Whole or in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.⁴⁴ By contrast, the resolutions creating the Select Committee on Ethics and the permanent Select Committee on Intelligence were considered as privileged resolutions, a procedure which precluded amendments, including amendments to provide for bipartisan memberships. In both cases, efforts to reverse this parliamentary situation were defeated.

As the foregoing discussion indicates, the House has utilized select committees from time to time to supplement the standing committee system in a variety of ways. The responsibilities of the standing committees are extensive, and their jurisdictions have been delineated carefully in the House rules. Periodically, efforts have been made to ensure that the committee system remains well adapted to changes in the scope of congressional activities and to changes in the character of the major issues before the Congress.

⁴² Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, Mar. 9, 1977, pp. H1882-H1883.

⁴³ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, July 14, 1977, p. H7114.

⁴⁴ Congressional Record (daily edition). v. 123, Mar. 10, 1977, pp. E1399-E1400.

Nonetheless, there have been a number of instances in which the House has evidently determined that it would be impractical or inappropriate to commit matters requiring congressional attention to one or more of its standing committees. Select committees have provided the House with a versatile and flexible mechanism for dealing with such matters. Although the relationship between standing and select committees has been a subject of recurring concern, the number of select committees in existence during the past several decades would seem to indicate a prevalent belief within the House that, under appropriate circumstances, select committees can contribute to the timeliness and responsiveness of congressional action without doing permanent damage to the integrity of the standing committee system.

SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
1947-82

The charts which follow provide information on each of the select and special committees created by the House of Representatives since 1947. Select or special committees in existence prior to 1947, but which were subsequently re-created, have been excluded.

The information presented in this report is based exclusively on committee reports and floor debates regarding resolutions which affected a select committee by establishing it, extending its lifetime, re-establishing it in the following Congress, providing funds for its expenses or amending its mandate or authority. Committee practices and activities not explicitly authorized by such resolutions have not been included.

The information on each select committee includes its date of creation, authorizing legislation, membership, functions and mandate, authorities, authorizations and expenditures, extensions and termination date, and principal issues regarding its creation. Also included is a summary chart providing selected data on all of the select committees.

Regarding select committee expenses, it should be noted that section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Congress) requires all House committees to submit a report to the Clerk of the House every 6 months which accounts for all appropriations and expenditures, and includes the name, title, and total salary of each staff member employed by it. The act directs that this information be published periodically in the Congressional Record when issued, and also as a House document.

Prior to 1971, the expenditures of committees were printed in semiannual reports entitled "U.S. House of Representatives Detailed Statement of Disbursements" which is the predecessor of the "Report of the Clerk of the House." The "Statement of Disbursements" recorded all committee expenditures chronologically on a daily basis, and did not provide a comprehensive accounting of expenses by committees. Therefore, the expenditures data from 1959 to 1970 included in this compilation were taken from the committee reports published in the Congressional Record.

In some instances the expenditures are considerably less than the amounts authorized due to late vouchers which were not paid at the time the select committee chairman submitted his or her report. In other instances prior to 1971, no accounting of expenditures was found in the Congressional Record for particular select committees. For example, on October 19, 1966, \$10,000 was authorized for the investigation and study to be conducted by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. No record of the amount of funds expended by this Select Committee was found in the Record and the chronological listing of the "Statement of Disbursements"

makes it an inefficient method for making an assessment of these expenditures.

The expenditure data for 1971 to 1976 were extracted from the "Report of the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

While the compilation does not include select or special committees in existence prior to 1947 that were subsequently re-created, the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures and the Select Committee to conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business are of particular significance.

On May 29, 1928, the House passed H. Res. 232 (70th Cong., 1st sess.) which authorized the establishment of a Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures to investigate election disputes, electoral fraud, and excess campaign expenditures of Presidential, Vice Presidential, senatorial, and/or congressional candidates. This Special Committee was reconstituted prior to each congressional election until 1973. However, the jurisdiction, powers, and scope of the investigations varied from Congress to Congress.

On December 4, 1941, the House approved H. Res. 294 (77th Cong., 1st sess.), creating the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business. The Select Committee was continuously reconstituted every 2 years by each successive Congress until the end of the 91st Congress. In 1971, at the commencement of the 92d Congress, the House amended rule X to give permanent status to the Select Committee on Small Business. Rule X, clause 3 then stated that:

The Select Committee on Small Business is a permanent select committee of the House without legislative jurisdiction except to make investigations and reports.

On February 7, 1973 (93d Cong., 1st sess.) the House agreed to H. Res. 19 which designated the composition of the Select Committee on Small Business, set forth its organization, and defined its jurisdiction, powers and duties.¹

The Committee on Small Business became a standing committee and its jurisdiction was redefined effective January 3, 1975, with the passage of H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF ALL MATTERS RELATED TO THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE SUPPLIES OF NEWS-PRINT, PRINTING, AND WRAPPING PAPER, PAPER PRODUCTS, PAPER PULP AND PULPWOOD

(Also known as the Select Committee on Newsprint)

Date of creation.—February 26, 1947.

Citation.—H. Res. 58, 80th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a record vote of 269-100).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Republicans: 4. Democrats: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

¹ For a detailed summary of the circumstances surrounding the creation of the Select Committee see "A History and Accomplishments of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives of the United States", 77th to 92d Congresses. House Document 93-197, 93d Cong. 2d sess.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized to conduct a study and investigation of all matters related to the need for adequate supplies, for use in the United States (including use in time of war), of newsprint, printing and wrapping paper, paper products, paper pulp and pulpwood, and of all matters related to means by which adequate supplies thereof may be produced or secured, with particular references to—

"(1) The short-range and long-range possibilities of increased production thereof in the continental United States (including Alaska);

"(2) The short-range and long-range prospects of securing increased supplies thereof from Canada and other sources outside the United States; and

"(3) The extent to which agencies or officers of the United States may be able to assist in furthering the objective of securing increased production and supplies thereof."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to submit preliminary reports to the House from time to time as it deemed advisable. The Select Committee was ordered to submit its final report to the House together with any recommendations as soon as practicable during the 80th Congress, upon completion of its investigation.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 59 (March 10, 1947) provided funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—80th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$25,000 authorized by H. Res. 59 on March 10, 1947.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: March 1, 1947 to January 4, 1949—\$9,332.92.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 80th Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on December 31, 1948.

Principal issues regarding creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to continue an investigation which had been conducted previously by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During debate on the resolution, no objection was made to the need for continuing the investigation; the primary question was whether the responsibility should be vested in a Select Committee or whether it should remain with the standing committees.

Supporters of the resolution argued that the mandate of the Select Committee would overlap the jurisdictions of as many as five

standing committees, as they had recently been reorganized under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Majority Leader, Rep. Halleck, argued that these standing committees were already heavily burdened, and that their efforts were directed primarily toward legislative matters. Consequently, he argued, the Select Committee was the proper vehicle to ensure an effective investigation. It was also contended that creation of the Select Committee would make it possible for the investigation to be continued by Members who had served on the Commerce Committee, but who had relinquished that assignment as a result of the Reorganization Act.

Critics of the resolution asserted that the investigation should be continued by the Commerce Committee and that, because jurisdictional disputes had not arisen in the past, they were not likely to arise in the future. More importantly, they argued that the creation of this Select Committee was a test case to determine if the House would abide by the spirit of the 1946 Act which, they believed, was contrary to the use of Select Committees. Although the House had deleted the ban against select and special committees from the Act, Rep. Monroney and others contended that the standing committees were fully authorized to conduct all necessary investigations and that the reorganization of committee jurisdictions made select committees unnecessary.

The resolution's supporters rejected this interpretation of the 1946 Act and emphasized that the House had, in effect, rejected a ban on select committees. Rep. Dirksen recalled that this decision had been made with the concurrence of Speaker Martin and former Speaker Rayburn. While critics of the resolution contended that the Select Committee was being created to suit the interests and desires of one or more former members of the Commerce subcommittee, its supporters argued instead that creating the Select Committee was a necessary means for the House to adjust to the Reorganization Act without losing the advantage of expertise which its Members had acquired on committees on which they no longer could serve.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Date of creation.—July 22, 1947.

Citation.—H. Res. 296; 80th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 19. Republicans: 11. Democrats: 8.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to make a study of: (1) Actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, and so forth, and of economic rehabilitation; (2) resources and facilities available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States; (3) existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such

needs; (4) any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy."

Significant changes in form or mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) from time to time as it deemed appropriate, but not later than March 1, 1984 (later extended to May 1, 1984).

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: None.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 332 (July 25, 1947) provided funds for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—80th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$125,000 authorized by H. Res. 332 on July 25, 1947.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: July 25, 1947 to June 30, 1948—\$113,551.32.

Termination.—Original termination date: March 1, 1948 (H. Res. 296).

Extensions: Extended to May 1, 1948 by H. Res. 476 on February 24, 1948.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on May 3, 1948. On June 8, 1948 the House passed H. Res. 601 which transferred all records of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation created by section 124 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472).

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution creating this Select Committee was adopted on a voice vote after little debate. Rep. Brown of Ohio, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, noted that at least six standing House committees had some jurisdiction over foreign aid questions and programs. Explaining that each of these standing committees would be represented on the Select Committee, he asserted that the Select Committee would provide specific information and a comprehensive overview which would assist the standing committees individually.

Members of the minority expressed some concern that travel expenses would be considerable and that the Select Committee might duplicate inquiries being conducted by the standing Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution as introduced had provided that the Select Committee could borrow special assistants from Government departments and agencies. This provision was deleted on the floor by a Rules Committee amendment adopted without debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TRANSACTIONS ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Date of creation.—December 18, 1947.

Citation.—H. Res. 404; 80th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Republicans: 4. Democrats: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation of purchases and sales of commodities, including transactions in the purchase and sale of commodities for future delivery and including: (a) The activities of any department or agency of the United States Government in connection with the purchase and sale of commodities, and into any other activities of any such agency or department that may have heretofore affected, or may hereafter affect, the price of food and other commodities; (b) the private acts, and official activities of any individual in the United States Government in connection with the purchase or sale of commodities."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to submit a report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) upon completion of its investigation as soon as practicable during the 80th Congress.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 407, December 19, 1947, provided funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—80th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$25,000 authorized by H. Res. 407 on December 19, 1947.

Subsequent funding: \$10,000 authorized by H. Res. 674 on June 18, 1948.

Total expenditures: December 19, 1947 to December 31, 1949—\$21,825.12

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 80th Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: End of 80th Congress; final report submitted to the House on December 31, 1948.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the Committee.—The Select Committee was created in response to allegations that inside, confidential information about prospective Government purchases had been used improperly by Government employees to profit from speculation in commodity futures. The Members who participated in discussion of the resolution were unanimous in their support for an investigation of these charges, although a question did arise as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture could provide some necessary information without explicit congressional authorization.

In opposition to the resolution, Rep. Monroney renewed his contention that all such investigations should be conducted by standing committees. He asserted that the investigation proposed in the resolution would fall fully within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and that, consequently, no select committee would be necessary. In response, however, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee expressed his personal opinion that his committee was too burdened with pressing legislative matters to conduct this investigation as well.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Date of creation.—August 12, 1949.

Citation.—H. Res. 298, 81st Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Democrats: 4. Republicans: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of: (1) All lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to submit preliminary reports to the House from time to time as it deemed advisable; and to submit its final report on the results of its study and investigations prior to the close of the 81st Congress.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution, H. Res. 379 (October 13, 1949), H. Res. 502 (March 23, 1950), and H. Res. 828 (September 21, 1950) authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The chairman or any other member of the committee was authorized to administer oaths to witnesses.

Authorizations and expenditures.—81st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: On September 28, 1949, the Committee on House Administration turned down H. Res. 297 requesting \$50,000 for the Select Committee's investigation. On October 13, 1949, the House approved H. Res. 379 which authorized \$40,000 for the Committee's investigation.

Subsequent funding: \$45,000 authorized by H. Res. 502 on March 23, 1950; \$10,000 authorized by H. Res. 828 on September 21, 1950.

Total expenditures: As of June 30, 1950, the total expenditures of the Select Committee—\$59,622.83.¹

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 81st Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination date: End of 81st Congress.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was created after a concurrent resolution, adopted by the House, to establish a joint Select Committee on the same subject failed to receive action by the Senate. Although some controversy subsequently arose over the Select Committee's procedures, the resolution creating it was adopted on a voice vote without significant opposition.

No objection was made to the desirability for such an inquiry to be conducted. However, Rep. Holifield of California asserted that creation of this and other select committees violated the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Echoing an argument made by Rep. Monroney in previous debates, Holifield noted that "provisions were placed in the act which obligated legislative committees to maintain continuous jurisdiction over legislation which emanated from those committees." He contended that the standing Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had ample authority and jurisdiction to conduct the inquiry authorized by the resolution. Nonetheless, he indicated his intention to support the resolution establishing the Select Committee.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS, PESTICIDES, AND INSECTICIDES IN AND WITH RESPECT TO FOOD PRODUCTS

Date of creation.—June 20, 1950.

Citation.—H. Res 323; 81st Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 74; 82d Congress, 1st Session, February 2, 1951 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Democrats: 4. Republicans: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of—

"(1) The nature, extent, and effect of the use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics in the production, processing, preparation and packaging of food products to determine the effect of the use of such chemicals, compounds, and synthetics: (a) upon the health and welfare of the Nation; and (b) upon the stability and well-being of our agricultural economy;

"(2) The nature, extent, and effect of the use of pesticides and insecticides with respect to food and food products, particularly the effect of such use of pesticides and insecticides upon the health and welfare of the consumer by reason of toxic resi-

¹ Data on expenditures of the Select Committee were obtained from the report of the Committee chairman to the Clerk of the House which is reprinted in the Congressional Record. However, data on the Select Committee's expenditures for July through December 1950 were not published in the Congressional Record.

dues remaining on such food and food products as a result of such use; and

"(3) The nature, effect, and extent of the use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics in the manufacture of fertilizer, particularly the effect of such use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics upon: (a) The condition of the soil as a result of the use of such fertilizer; (b) the quantity and quality of the vegetation growing from such soil; (c) the health of animals consuming such vegetation; (d) the quantity and quality of food produced from such soil; and (e) the public health and welfare generally."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: During the 82d Congress, 2d Session, on October 15, 1951 the House agreed to H. Res. 447 which expanded the mandate of the Committee to include "* * * an investigation and study of the nature, extent, and effect of the use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics in the production, processing, preparation, and packaging of cosmetics to determine the effect of the use of such chemicals, compounds, and synthetics upon the health and welfare of the Nation."

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was originally authorized to report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) as soon as practicable during the 81st Congress on the result of its investigation, together with any recommendations for legislation. The reporting date was later extended to the end of the 82d Congress by H. Res. 74, adopted on February 2, 1951.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The establishing resolution, H. Res. 323, authorized the Select Committee to employ "on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants" as it deemed necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: The Select Committee was authorized by H. Res. 323 to "utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government."

Special authorities: None.

Authorization and expenditures.—81st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 739 on August 21, 1950.

Subsequent funding: None.

82d Congress: Authorization in resolution re-establishing Select Committee: None.

Subsequent funding: \$75,000 authorized by H. Res. 128 on February 20, 1951.

Total expenditures: June 20, 1950 to January 3, 1953—\$51,915.48.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 81st Congress.

Extensions: Extended to end of 82d Congress by H. Res. 74 on February 2, 1951.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on January 3, 1953.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution to establish the Select Committee was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee and adopted by the House on a

voice vote without objection being voiced. Resolutions to re-create the Select Committee during the 82d Congress and to extend its authority to include the health effects of cosmetics were also adopted on voice votes without opposition.

The only questions raised during debate related to the necessity for a Select Committee and to procedures for issuing subpoenas. Rep. Miller of Nebraska argued that a Select Committee should be created because the Committee on Agriculture was occupied with other matters and because that standing committee did not have jurisdiction over public health questions. Regarding subpoenas, Mr. Brown of Ohio sought to make it clear that subpoenas could only be issued by the chairman or his designee with the authorization of the Select Committee. He indicated that the provision on subpoena authority in this resolution was essentially the same as those in other resolutions creating select committees, but that some questions have arisen as to whether, under this authority, a select committee chairman could issue a subpoena at his own discretion.

**SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ABUSES IN EDUCATION, TRAINING
AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS**

Date of creation.—August 28, 1950.

Citation.—H. Res. 474, 81st Congress, 2d session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 93, 82d Congress, 1st session, February 2, 1951 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 9. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the alleged abuses in the education and training program of World War II veterans, and of action taken or the lack of action taken by the responsible officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and State approving authorities to prevent abuses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 93, adopted on February 2, 1951, to reestablish the Select Committee for the 82d Congress, expanded the mandate of the Select Committee to include loan guaranty programs for veterans.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The original establishing resolution authorized the Select Committee to submit a report on the results of its investigation, as soon as practicable during the 81st Congress. H. Res. 93, reauthorized the Committee and extended the reporting date to the end of the 82d Congress.

Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The funding resolutions authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical and stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The chairman or any other member of the Select Committee was authorized to administer oaths to witnesses.
Authorizations and expenditures.—81st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 832 on September 21, 1950.

Subsequent funding: None.

82d Congress: Authorization in resolution reestablishing Select Committee: None.

Subsequent funding: \$60,000 authorized by H. Res. 133 on February 20, 1951. \$15,000 authorized by H. Res. 488 on March 19, 1952.

Total expenditures: September 22, 1950 to December 31, 1952—\$97,034.15.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 81st Congress.

Extensions: Reestablished by H. Res. 93 for the 82d Congress on February 2, 1951.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on September 11, 1952.

Principal issues regarding creation of the committee.—The resolution to create the Select Committee, as well as the resolution to recreate it during the following Congress, were both adopted by voice votes without extended debate and without any opposition being expressed.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Date of creation.—September 18, 1951.

Citation.—H. Res. 390; 82d Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Democrats: 4. Republicans: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in a mass grave in the Katyn Forest on the banks of the Dnieper in the vicinity of Smolensk, which was then a Nazi-occupied territory formerly having been occupied and under the control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 539 of March 11, 1952 amended H. Res. 390 to permit the Select Committee to hold hearings outside the United States.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was ordered to report, upon completion of its hearings, to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) before the adjournment of the 82d Congress. The reporting date was later extended to January 3, 1953 (commencement of the 83d Congress) by H. Res. 539.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 410 of September 27, 1951, authorized funds for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary. H. Res. 556 of March 20, 1952, additionally authorized funds for the employment of investigators and attorneys.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—82d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$20,000 authorized by H. Res. 410 on September 27, 1951.

Subsequent funding: \$65,000 authorized by H. Res. 556 on March 20, 1952.

Total expenditures: September 27, 1951 to December 31, 1952—\$63,945.93.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 82d Congress.

Extensions: Extended by H. Res. 539 to January 3, 1953.

Actual termination: December 22, 1952.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to investigate the circumstances surrounding the deaths of at least 15,000 Polish officers during World War II and, if possible, to determine responsibility for the massacre. The resolution to create the Select Committee was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House on a voice vote without opposition being expressed.

Opposition did arise, however, during consideration of subsequent resolutions to authorize foreign travel by the Select Committee for the purpose of taking testimony and to provide additional funds for Committee expenses. The previous question on the first of these two resolutions was ordered by a record vote of 164-156. Arguments offered in opposition were: (1) That the costs of the investigation were excessive; (2) that the principal purpose of the investigation—to fix responsibility for the massacre—had already been accomplished; and (3) that the work of the Select Committee was unlikely to lead to further, appropriate congressional action. This last criticism was expressed by Rep. Stanley of Virginia, as follows:

In the eyes of the rest of the world, and I refer particularly to the free nations, what possible jurisdiction does the Congress of the United States have over Russian atrocities committed against Polish nationals? Would not we be accused of meddling? There may be propaganda value in this investigation, and I do not doubt that there is, but what is our jurisdiction over these murders? It is like a court in California, trying a murder case committed in Florida, when the murderer cannot be caught even if he is convicted.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Date of creation.—April 4, 1952.

Citation.—H. Res. 561, 82d Congress, 2d Session, (adopted by a recorded vote of 194-158). H. Res. 217, 83d Congress, 1st Session, July 27, 1953 (adopted by a recorded vote of 209-163).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Democrats: 4. Republicans: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for purposes other than the purposes for which they were established, and especially to determine which such foundations and organizations are using their resources for un-American and subversive activities or for purposes not in the interest or tradition of the United States."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 217 of July 27, 1953, which reestablished the Select Committee for the 83d Congress expanded the Select Committee's jurisdiction; authorizing it to investigate tax exempt foundations and organizations to determine if any such organizations were using their resources for political purposes, propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) on the results of its investigations on or before January 1, 1953. The reporting date was later extended by H. Res. 217 to January 3, 1955.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 638 (June 30, 1952) provided funds for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and clerical and stenographic assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—82d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$75,000 authorized by H. Res. 638 on June 30, 1952.

Subsequent funding: None.

83d Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Authorization in subsequent funding resolution: \$50,000 authorized by H. Res. 373 on August 1, 1953. \$65,000 authorized by H. Res. 433 on April 6, 1954.

84th Congress: Subsequent funding: Additional authorizations were made during the 84th Congress for expenses incurred by the Select Committee during the 83d Congress as follows: H. Res. 454, May 8, 1956—\$909.77. H. Res. 310, July 21, 1955—\$67.46.

Total expenditures: \$162,586.61 expenses from June 30, 1952 to January 1, 1955.

Termination.—Original termination date: January 1, 1953.

Extensions: Extended to January 3, 1955 by H. Res. 217 on July 27, 1953.

Actual termination: December 16, 1954.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—After extended debate, the House established the Select Committee to examine the activities of tax-exempt foundations, particularly to de-

termine if any such foundations had been assisting un-American or subversive activities. In opposition to the resolution, some Members expressed the fear that the mandate of the Select Committee was too broad and vague, and that the committee might become a vehicle for the promotion of its members' personal political philosophies.

Opposition was also based on the contention that the Select Committee would duplicate the jurisdiction and the current activities of the Committees on Ways and Means, Un-American Activities, and, to a lesser extent, Education and Labor. Once again, the argument was made that the intent of Congress in enacting the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to obviate the need for select committees, and that, whenever possible, investigations should be conducted by the appropriate standing committees which would be able to recommend remedial legislation. In response, supporters of the resolution argued that it had been revised to take account of the jurisdictions and activities of the standing committees, and that these committees lacked the time and staff to conduct the thorough investigation planned for the Select Committee.

During the following Congress, the resolution reestablishing the Select Committee provoked another extended debate focusing on the same arguments. Additionally, supporters of the Committee asserted that it needed more time to complete its work, while opponents contended that a sufficient investigation had already been completed and that the standing committees could take whatever additional action was necessary.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF OFFENSIVE AND UNDESIRABLE BOOKS, MAGAZINES, AND COMIC BOOKS

Date of creation.—May 12, 1952.

Citation.—H. Res. 596; 82d Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 9. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: H. Res. 596 specified that the members of the Select Committee "be appointed by the Speaker, three from the Committee on the Judiciary, three from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and three from the membership of the House without reference to any committee." The resolution also specified that not more than five members of the Select Committee were to be appointed from the same political party.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker from among the membership of the Select Committee.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study: (1) To determine the extent to which current literature—books, magazines, and comic books—containing immoral, obscene, or otherwise offensive matter, or placing improper emphasis on crime, violence, and corruption, are being made available to the people of the United States through the United States mails and otherwise; and (2) to determine the adequacy of existing law to prevent the publication and distribution of books containing immoral, offensive, and other undesirable matter."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) as soon as practicable during the 82d Congress, on the results of its investigations and study, together with any recommendations, including recommendations for legislation as it deemed advisable.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee was authorized to utilize the employees and facilities of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—82d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$25,000 authorized by H. Res. 692 on July 2, 1952.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: July 2, 1952, to January 3, 1953—\$20,266.74.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 82d Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: December 31, 1952.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—Debate on the resolution focused on the scope of the Select Committee's mandate and on whether its expected investigation was likely to jeopardize individual rights under the First Amendment. Supporters of the resolution explained that radio and television were excluded from the resolution in order to avoid a jurisdictional conflict with the standing Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA,
LATVIA, AND ESTONIA INTO THE U.S.S.R.

(Also known as Select Committee on Communist Aggression)

Date of creation.—July 27, 1953.

Citation.—H. Res. 346; 83d Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 7 (increased to 9 by H. Res. 438 on March 4, 1954). Republicans: 4 (increased to 5). Democrats: 3 (increased to 4).

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of said seizure and forced 'incorporation' of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and 'incorporation'."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 438 on March 4, 1954, amended the establishing resolution by expanding the mandate of the Select Committee, increasing its membership, and authorizing it to conduct hearings outside the United States after March 1, 1954. The Committee's expanded mandate is as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of: (1) The seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and "incorporation"; and (2) the subversion and destruction of free institutes and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) as soon as practicable during the 83d Congress on the results of its investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deemed advisable.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 356, the initial funding resolution adopted on July 31, 1953, authorized funds for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The Select Committee was authorized to conduct necessary inquiries abroad as of March 1, 1954.

Authorizations and expenditures.—83d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 356 on July 31, 1953.

Subsequent funding: \$150,000 authorized by H. Res. 467 on April 8, 1954. On May 8, 1956, the House adopted H. Res. 454 which authorized funds in the amount of \$909.77 for expenses incurred by the Select Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations and the Select Committee on the Baltic States.

Total expenditures: June 30, 1953, to July 31, 1954—\$150,640.13.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 83d Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual Termination: December 31, 1954.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to investigate Soviet aggression in the Baltic and, by resolution in 1954, in other nations of Eastern Europe. The 1954 resolution also added two additional members to the Committee and authorized it to conduct inquiries abroad. No opposition was expressed to either resolution. Rep. Price of Illinois explained that the investigation would "bring out the truth to the whole world" and constitute "a very powerful psychological blow against communism."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY CERTAIN BENEFITS FOR
SURVIVING DEPENDENTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEM-
BERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Date of creation.—August 4, 1954.

Citation.—H. Res. 549, 83d Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 35; 84th Congress, 1st Session, February 2, 1955 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 5. Republicans: 3. Democrats: 2.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed: (1) To conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces; and (2) on the basis of such investigation, and study, to make such recommendations as it may deem advisable and to prepare such legislation as it may consider appropriate to carry out such recommendations."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes, 84th Congress only.

The establishing resolution, H. Res. 549 authorized the Select Committee "to prepare such legislation as it may consider appropriate to carry out such recommendations." H. Res. 35, approved February 2, 1955, which reauthorized the Select Committee during the 84th Congress, expanded the authority of the Committee by authorizing it to "report to the House, by bill or otherwise * * *"

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House on the results of its investigations as soon as practicable during the 83d Congress. The reporting date was later extended to January 15, 1956 by H. Res. 35, adopted on February 2, 1955.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: No.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 701, August 10, 1954, authorized funds for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—83d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$20,000 authorized by H. Res. 701 on August 10, 1954.

Subsequent funding: None.

84th Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: \$35,000 authorized by H. Res. 128 on February 24, 1955.

Total expenditures: January 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956—\$34,368.04. No expenditures reported for the period August 10, 1954 through December 31, 1954.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 83d Congress.

Extensions: Extended to January 15, 1956 by H. Res. 35 on February 2, 1955.

Actual termination: January 15, 1956.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution, adopted by voice vote, provided for the Select Committee to inquire into Federal benefits for dependents of deceased and former members of the armed services. In explanation, Rep. Bates of Massachusetts noted that at least four standing committees had relevant legislative jurisdiction, and that a select committee could take a more comprehensive approach to the subject.

When the Select Committee was reestablished during the 84th Congress, it was authorized to report appropriate legislation to the House, Rep. Ellsworth of Oregon arguing that:

this problem which the select committee would undertake to look into has many ramifications; in other words, it was discovered in the past experience of this committee and brought out in testimony before the Rules Committee that legislation to improve or remedy these matters which were bound to need legislation might come under the jurisdiction of 4, or perhaps 5 or 6 committees. In other words, the presentation of the legislation recommended by this select committee would involve automatically a problem of committee jurisdiction.

This second resolution was also adopted by voice vote, over the objections of Rep. Rogers of Massachusetts, who expressed the fear that:

[i]n doing this, you are setting another precedent voting for the future to take away the prerogatives of the committees * * *. I think all of the ills could be remedied by legislation from within our own committees.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Date of creation.—May 25, 1955.

Citation.—H. Res. 244; 84th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 205-166).

Membership.—Number of members: 3. Democrats: 2. Republicans: 1.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission established by Public Law 37, 77th Congress, with a view to ascertaining when it may be expected that the bridge and approaches thereto operated by such commission near New Harmony, Ind., will become free of tolls, and what money has been received, and what expenditures have been made, by such commission since its establishment in 1941."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) as soon as practicable during the 84th Congress on the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations.

Authority. — Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 272 (July 21, 1955) authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorization and expenditures.—84th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$10,000 authorized by H. Res. 272 on July 21, 1955.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: July 21, 1955, to June 30, 1956—\$4,334.91.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 84th Congress.

Extension: None.

Actual termination: Report submitted to the House on April 25, 1956.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to sponsor an audit of the White County Bridge Commission, operating a federally authorized toll bridge between Illinois and Indiana. Most of the debate focused on the need for an audit, although questions were raised about the propriety of congressional intervention in what was described as essentially a local matter.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

Date of creation.—June 27, 1956.

Citation.—Public Law 84-624; 84th Congress, 2d Session (2 U.S.C. 123b) (H.R. 11473, Legislative Branch Appropriation Act of 1957, approved June 27, 1956).

Membership.—Number of members: 3. Democrats: 2. Republicans: 1.

Mode of selecting members: The law directed that the Select Committee be composed of three Members of the House, two from the majority party and one from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: Public Law 84-624 directed that the House Recording Studio be operated by the "Clerk of the House of Representatives under the direction and control of a committee which is hereby created * * * composed of three members * * *." The Select Committee was "authorized to issue such rules and regulations relating to operation of the House Recording Studio as it may deem necessary." The law directed that price fixing of disk, film, and recordings by the Clerk of the House of Representatives be subject to approval by the Select Committee. Expenditures by the House Recording Studio are subject to regulations approved by the Select Committee. The Clerk of the House of Representatives was authorized, subject to the approval of the Select Committee, to fix the compensation of a Director of the House Recording Studio and such other employees as are deemed necessary to its operation.

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Not specified.

Authority to report: Not specified.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: None.

Provisions regarding staffing: None.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—Authorization in establishing legislation: A revolving fund was authorized to be established for the operation of the House Recording Studio, but no mention was made of funds specifically for the activities of the Select Committee on the House Recording Studio. However, the law authorized to be appropriated such "sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of * * *" this section of the law.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: No funds requested from the contingent fund of the House.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: There were no expenditures reported in the "Report of the Clerk of the House" or the Congressional Record from 1957 to 1976 for the activities of the Select Committee, although disbursements from the revolving fund are recorded in the Clerk's Report.

Termination.—Original termination date: Not specified.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The provisions relating to the House Recording Studio and the Select Committee were not a subject of discussion during consideration of the act making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1957. Rep. Norrell of Arkansas explained that these provisions had been included at the request of, and after consultation with, the appropriate legislative committees.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE EXPLORATION

Date of creation.—March 5, 1958.

Citation.—H. Res. 496; 85th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 13. Democrats: 7. Republicans 6.

Mode of selecting members: H. Res. 496 directed that the Committee be composed of 13 members appointed by the Speaker, 7 from the majority party and 6 from the minority party.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation with respect to all aspects and problems relating to the exploration of outer space and the control, development, and use of astronautical resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes, the Select Committee was authorized to consider all bills and resolutions proposing legislation in the field of astronautics and space exploration.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House by bill or otherwise by June 1, 1958, or the earliest date thereafter, but by no later than January 3, 1959.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 500, the initial funding resolution for the Select Committee, authorized funds for the employment of technical, clerical, stenographic, consultants, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—85th Congress: Authorizations in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$100,000 authorized by H. Res. 500 on March 19, 1958.

Subsequent funding: \$85,000 authorized by H. Res. 635 on August 6, 1958.

Total expenditures: Not available.

Termination.—Original termination date: January 3, 1959.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: On July 21, 1958, the House approved H. Res. 580 which established a standing Committee on Science and Astronautics to continue the work of the Select Committee. On January 7, 1959, the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration issued two reports.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committees.—The Select Committee was created by adoption of H. Res. 496 on a voice vote without debate. However, several weeks before the House acted, Rep. Keating of New York had offered the following arguments in support of the proposed committee:

Various bills have been introduced concerning the multitude of unresolved questions deriving from man's venture into space. No single committee is now constituted to deal comprehensively and in a coordinated fashion with these measures. In many instances, a single bill cuts across the lines of interest of a number of our standing committees.

The result already is that a number of committees may want to duplicate hearings on a single issue or series of issues. We may witness the unappetizing sight of committee chairmen fighting for the first crack at a bill. And department and agency heads could well spend all their working hours trudging up to the Hill to appear before the plethora of committees considering outer-space problems.

The committee was granted legislative authority, but several months later, the House created the standing Committee on Science and Astronautics to assume and continue the Select Committee's activities.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Date of creation.—September 7, 1961.

Citation.—H. Res. 403, 87th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a division of 90-1).

Membership.—Number of members: 5, Democrats: 3, Republicans: 2.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export

Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended, with a view to assessing the accomplishments under that Act, determining whether improvements can be made in the administration, operation, or enforcement thereof, and improving congressional oversight and guidance over the formation of United States policies involved in such Act. In carrying out such investigation and study, the committee shall give particular attention to the following matters:

"(1) The problems involved in the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries comprising the Sino-Soviet bloc.

"(2) Present methods and procedures in the formulation of policy with respect to the determination of which articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled under such Act, and the extent of such control.

"(3) Procedures followed under such Act in obtaining information, advice, and opinions with respect to determination of which articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled under such Act, from departments and agencies of the United States which are concerned with aspects of our domestic or foreign policies and operations which have a bearing on exports.

"(4) The extent to which decisions heretofore made under such Act concerning the control of exports have adversely affected the security of the United States.

"(5) Whether or not such Act is being administered by the appropriate department of the Federal Government.

"(6) The interrelationship between such Act and related Acts (such as the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, and the Trading With the Enemy Act) and other discussions or agreements entered into by the United States (such as the coordinating committee (COCOM) discussions and agreements) which affect or relate to the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House was not in session) the results of its investigation and study, together with any recommendations it deemed advisable.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. The initial funding resolution, H. Res. 453, authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—87th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$40,000 authorized by H. Res. 453 on September 19, 1961.

Subsequent funding: \$10,000 authorized by H. Res. 704 on July 25, 1962.

Total expenditures: September 7, 1961, to December 31, 1962—\$47,543.88.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 87th Congress. Extensions: None.

Actual termination: Report submitted to the House on May 31, 1962.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to study U.S. trade policies regarding the Soviet Union and its allies, and especially the export of strategic materials. There were no objections to the resolution, although one Member did seek clarification that the Select Committee's jurisdiction would not compete or conflict with an inquiry already being conducted by an existing House subcommittee.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXPENDITURES FOR RESEARCH PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY OR SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Also known as the Select Committee on Government Research)

Date of creation.—September 11, 1963.

Citation.—H. Res. 504; 88th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 336 to 0).

Membership.—Number of members: 9. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman; One of the members of the Select Committee was appointed chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "directed to make a complete, full, and thorough investigation of the numerous research programs being conducted by sundry departments and agencies of the Federal Government and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the committee shall give special attention to the following: (1) The overall total amount of annual expenditures on research programs; (2) what departments and agencies of the Government are conducting research and at what costs; (3) the amounts being expended by the various agencies and departments in grants and contracts for research to colleges, private industry, and every form of student scholarships; (4) what facilities, if any, exist for coordinating the various and sundry research programs, including grants to colleges and universities as well as scholarship grants."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report "its findings to the House with such recommended legislation as the committee may deem appropriate to correct any deficiencies." The Select Committee was authorized to submit interim reports, and its final report prior to December 1, 1964.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 523, adopted on October 2, 1963, authorized funds for the employment of professional personnel, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: H. Res. 504 provided the following: "In order that this investigation of the numerous research programs may be better coordinated, without limiting the scope of the said committee's investigation, it is directed, among other investigative procedures, to make use of information currently available in the various committees of Congress which have legislative jurisdiction over Government research activities to the end that the said select committee may be able to recommend the necessary legislation to coordinate and prevent justifiable duplication in the numerous projects and activities of the Government relating to scientific research."

Authorizations and expenditures.—88th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$553,000 authorized by H. Res. 523 on October 2, 1963.

Subsequent funding: None.

89th Congress: Subsequent funding: H. Res. 87 of January 7, 1965, authorized the payment out of the contingent fund of the House "such sums as may be necessary to pay the compensation and other expenses of assimilating data, compiling a summary report * * * and otherwise closing the work of the Select Committee on Government Research."

Total expenditures: September 11, 1963, to December 13, 1964—\$319,570.55.

Termination.—Original termination date: December 1, 1964.

Extensions: Extended to January 3, 1965, by H. Res. 810 on August 5, 1964.

Actual termination: January 3, 1965.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution to establish the Select Committee was adopted without opposition. Created to review the costs, coordination, and duplication of Federal research efforts, the Committee, according to Rep. Brown of Ohio, was intended to complement the work of standing committees with jurisdiction over research in specific policy areas:

Mr. Speaker, a great many of the legislative committees of the House have jurisdiction over some phase or phases of research, and have done a very good, workmanlike job of looking into the research activities that come under their jurisdiction. Yet, Mr. Speaker, no one committee has a complete or an overall picture of the research activities of the Federal Government. No one committee of the House knows what some other committee may know about certain research matters.

Members of several standing committees pledged their cooperation with the Select Committee, while indicating that they were already examining research activities within their respective jurisdictions.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FACTORS RELATING TO THE GENERAL WELFARE AND EDUCATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

Date of creation.—September 30, 1964.

Citation.—H. Res. 847; 88th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 5. Democrats: 3. Republicans: 2.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all of the factors relating to the general welfare and education of congressional pages, including, but not limited to, a study and investigation of the residential, dining, recreational, educational, and physical training facilities and opportunities for such pages, and rates of pay, hours of work, and other conditions governing the employment of such pages."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was directed to report to the House as soon as practicable during the 88th Congress on the results of its investigation and study. The Select Committee was authorized to make "recommendations regarding the feasibility and desirability of raising the minimum age for Capitol pages to eighteen years, of requiring secondary school graduation as a prerequisite for appointment as a Capitol page, and of providing for the establishment and construction of a Capitol page school and residence, and such other recommendations as it deems advisable."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—88th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: No record of funds expended by this committee was found in the Congressional Record, or other sources consulted.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 88th Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: Report submitted to the House on January 4, 1965.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution establishing the Select Committee was adopted without debate or opposition.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Date of creation.—October 19, 1966.

Citation.—H. Res. 1013; 89th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 256-0).

Membership.—Number of members: 12. Democrats: 6. Republicans: 6.

Mode of selecting members: The establishing resolution stipulated that the twelve members of the Committee be appointed by the Speaker as follows: six from the majority party and six from the minority party.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct was authorized to:

"(1) Recommend to the House, by report or resolution such additional rules or regulations as the Select Committee shall determine to be necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the House and by officers or employees of the House, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities; and

"(2) Report violations, by a majority vote of the Select Committee, of any law to the proper Federal and State authorities."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to make recommendations to the House by report or resolution on the subjects under its jurisdiction. No reporting date was specified in the establishing resolution.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in the establishing resolution. H. Res. 1069, the funding resolution, authorized funds for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in the establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—89th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$10,000 authorized by H. Res. 1069 on October 19, 1966.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: No record of the amount of funds expended by the Select Committee was found in the Congressional Record. The statement of disbursements published by the Committee on House Administration for 1966 and 1967 is listed chronologically on a daily basis. There is no comprehensive listing by committee.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 89th Congress. Extensions: None.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on December 27, 1966. On April 13, 1967 the House agreed to H. Res. 418 creating a standing committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—As reported to the House from the Committee on Rules, the resolution to create the Select Committee provided that it would have the authority: (1) To receive and investigate allegations of improper conduct by Members, officers, and employees; (2) by a two-thirds vote, to recommend that disciplinary action be taken by the House in specific cases; and (3) to make recommendations for additional legislation.

The Members participating in debate generally agreed to the need for a committee to consider questions of ethical conduct, but questions were raised concerning: (1) The definition of improper conduct; (2) the specificity of the proposed Committee's mandate and authority; (3) the protections available to Members under the

resolution and the Rules of the House; and (4) the wisdom of creating such a Committee with an investigative mandate during the closing days of the Congress. In view of these concerns, the previous questions of the resolution was rejected.

After the rejection of a motion to table the resolution, Rep. Hays of Ohio offered an amendment which removed the Committee's authority to receive and investigate allegations and to recommend disciplinary action. Instead, the Hays amendment provided that the Committee should concentrate primarily on making recommendations, by report or resolution, for any additional rules or regulations it deemed necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct. Rep. Hays explained that these recommendations could be considered by the House when the next Congress convened, and that the House could decide at that time whether it wished to create a select or standing committee to investigate specific allegations against Members and staff. After some discussion, the amendment was agreed to by a voice vote and the resolution as amended was then adopted by a unanimous rollcall vote.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REPORT TO THE HOUSE UPON THE QUESTION OF THE RIGHT OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL TO BE SWORN IN AS A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

Date of creation.—January 10, 1967.

Citation.—H. Res. 1, 90th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 363-65).

Membership.—Number of members: 9. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: All members of the Special Committee were appointed by the Speaker. H. Res. 1 specified that four of the nine members be members of the minority party and appointed after consultation with the Minority Leader.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Special Committee was appointed to consider the "question of the right of Adam Clayton Powell to be sworn in as a Representative from the State of New York in the Ninetieth Congress, as well as his final right to a seat therein as Representative * * *."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Special Committee was authorized to report to the House within five weeks after the appointment of the members of the Special Committee.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 177, adopted on February 8, 1967, authorized funds for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—90th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$25,000 authorized by H. Res. 177 on February 8, 1967.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: No record of the amount of funds expended by the Special Committee was found in the Congressional Record. The statement of disbursements published by the Committee on House Administration is listed chronologically on a daily basis (prior to 1970). There is no comprehensive listing by committee.

Termination.—Original termination date: Five weeks after the appointment of the members of the Special Committee, who were appointed January 19, 1967.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: February 23, 1967.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The primary issue debated by the House was whether Rep. Powell of New York should be seated prior or subsequent to the investigation conducted by the Special Committee. There was no objection to referring the matter to a special committee, nor to its composition, mandate, or authority.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

Date of creation.—December 6, 1967.

Citation.—H. Res. 1000; 90th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 258; 91st Congress, 1st Session, February 19, 1969 (adopted by a voice vote). Public Law 91-145, December 12, 1969, Legislative Branch Appropriations for fiscal year 1970.

Membership.—Number of members: 3. Democrats: 2. Republicans: 1.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The establishing resolution directed that "until otherwise ordered by the House, the management of the House Beauty Shop and all matters connected therewith shall be under the direction of the Select Committee * * * and shall be operated under such rules and regulations as such Committee may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said Beauty Shop by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management." The Select Committee was authorized by H. Res. 1000 of the 90th Congress to purchase equipment and materials for initial operations of the shop at a cost not to exceed \$15,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act Approved on December 12, 1969, authorized the establishment of a Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop. The jurisdiction and membership of the Select Committee was not changed. However, the law provided for the establishment of a revolving fund for the House Beauty Shop in the United States Treasury. The General Accounting Office was authorized to audit the activities of the Beauty Shop when directed to do so by the Select Committee.

Legislative authority: Not specified.

Authority to report: Not specified.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: No.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—90th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: \$15,000 authorized by H. Res. 1000 for the purchase of initial equipment and supplies of House Beauty Shop.

Subsequent funding: No additional funds requested for Committee activities.

Total expenditures: Funds authorized for the initial operations of the Beauty Shop were repaid to the contingent fund of the House by May 13, 1969. Neither the "Report of the Clerk of the House" nor the Congressional Record for 1967 to 1976 contain any record of expenditures by the Select Committee in the performance of its duties as outlined in the authorizing legislation.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 90th Congress.

Extensions: Extended by H. Res. 258, 90th Congress, 1st Session on February 19, 1969, to the end of the 91st Congress; and reauthorized by Public Law 91-145 on December 12, 1969.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was created by resolution in 1967 and again in 1969 without debate. Later in 1969, the Select Committee was established by law in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO REGULATE PARKING ON THE HOUSE SIDE OF THE CAPITOL

Date of creation.—March 13, 1969.

Citation.—H. Res. 282; 91st Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 24; 92d Congress, 1st Session, February 10, 1971 (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 145; 93d Congress, 1st Session, February 7, 1973 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 3. Democrats: 2. Republicans 1.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized to exercise direction over the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives in the assignment of space for outdoor parking of automobiles in squares 639, south of 635, and 692, located adjacent to the House Office Buildings, and for all other outdoor parking of automobiles on the House side of the United States Capitol Grounds." The establishing resolution also directed the House Office Building Commission "to delegate so much of such duties as pertain to the direction and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol in the assignment of space for parking of automobiles in the garages in the Rayburn House Office Building, the Cannon House Office Building, and the two underground garages in squares 637 and 691, located adjacent to the House Office Build-

ings, and the issuance of regulations governing such assignments, to the select committee * * *

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: None.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Executive Branch assistance: None.

Special authorities: None.

Authorization and expenditures.—Authorization in establishing resolutions: None

Authorization in initial funding resolution: None requested.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: Neither the "Report of the Clerk of the House" nor the Congressional Record for 1969 through 1974 contain any record of expenditures for this Select Committee.

Termination.—Original termination: End of 91st Congress.

Extensions: Reauthorized by H. Res. 24 for the 92d Congress on February 10, 1971, and by H. Res. 145 for the 93d Congress on February 7, 1973.

Actual termination: End of the 93d Congress. At the beginning of the 94th Congress, the Committee on House Administration created a Subcommittee on Parking.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established by resolution on three occasions without debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Date of creation.—May 1, 1969.

Citation.—H. Res. 17; 91st Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 345-18). H. Res. 115; 92d Congress, 1st Session, March 9, 1971 (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 256; 93d Congress, 1st Session, February 28, 1973 (adopted by a recorded vote of 317-75).

Membership.—Number of members: 7 (increased to 11 by H. Res. 115 on March 9, 1971). Democrats: 4 (increased to 6). Republicans: 3 (increased to 5).

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States, including: (1) Its elements, causes, and extent; (2) the preparation, collection, and dissemination of statistics thereon, and the availability of reciprocity of information among law enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local, including exchange of information with foreign nations; (3) the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues pertaining thereto; (4) the effect of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; (5) the effect, directly or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation; (6) the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of

crimes; (7) measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crime; (8) measures for the improvement of (a) detection of crime, (b) law enforcement, including increased cooperation among the agencies thereof, (c) the administration of justice and (9) measures and programs for increased respect for the law."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: The membership of the Select Committee was increased to eleven by H. Res. 115, March 9, 1971, which reauthorized the Select Committee for the 92d Congress.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House as soon as practicable during the 91st Congress on the results of its investigation together with any recommendations it deemed advisable. This date was later extended to June 30, 1973.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 399, May 14, 1969, the initial funding resolution authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—91st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$375,000 authorized by H. Res. 399 on May 14, 1969.

Subsequent funding: \$600,000 authorized by H. Res. 808 on March 25, 1970.

92d Congress: Authorization in reauthorizing resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: \$675,000 authorized by H. Res. 337 on April 29, 1971; \$470,000 authorized by H. Res. 910 on April 11, 1972.

93d Congress: Subsequent funding: \$331,160.20 was authorized by H. Res. 309 on March 22, 1973.

Total expenditures: \$2,363,047.09 expenditures May 1, 1969, to June 30, 1973.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 91st Congress.

Extensions: H. Res. 115 on March 9, 1971 extended the Committee for the duration of the 92d Congress, H. Res. 256 on February 28, 1973, extended the Select Committee to June 30, 1973.

Actual termination: June 30, 1973.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established in lieu of a joint committee which the House had voted to create during the previous Congress. Although described by its supporters as a coordinating device and a clearinghouse for information, the proposed Select Committee was criticized by Rep. Wiggins of California as an "encroachment" on the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. Wiggins also contented that the problem of crime had already been studied sufficiently, and that the need instead was for legislation which could only be reported by a standing committee of the House. Other members of the Judiciary Committee supported the resolution, but did indicate their expectation that its members would be represented on the Select Committee.

When the Select Committee was reestablished, and its membership increased, at the beginning of the next Congress, opposition was expressed on the basis of: (1) Reservations about the size of the Committee's staff and the costs of its investigations and field hearings, (2) fears that the Select Committee might assume permanent status, and (3) assertions that there had been unnecessary duplication of effort between it and both the Judiciary and Commerce Committees.

At the beginning of the 93d Congress, the Select Committee was again re-created, but only for a six-month period to provide for a smooth transition of its responsibilities to the Judiciary Committee. Rep. Bolling noted that an understanding had been reached for the Judiciary Committee to continue some of the efforts begun by the Select Committee.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

Date of creation.—July 10, 1969.

Citation.—H. Res. 472; 91st Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 317; 92d Congress, 1st Session, March 25, 1971 (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 111; 93d Congress, 1st Session, February 7, 1973 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 5. Democrats: 3. Republicans: 2.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker; the establishing resolution specified that no more than three of its members shall be of the majority party.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker from among the members of the Select Committee.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was established to supervise the operation of the House Restaurant. The establishing resolution directed that "[O]n and after July 15, 1969, until otherwise ordered by the House, the Architect of the Capitol shall perform the duties vested in him by section 208 of Public Law 812, 76th Congress (40 U.S.C. 173K) under the direction of the Select Committee * * *."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 317, on March 25, 1971, reauthorized the Select Committee for the 92d Congress and expanded its jurisdiction. The Committee on House Administration was delegated authority over the direction and supervision of the House Restaurant and facilities. The Select Committee was authorized to "exercise direction and supervision over immediate management and operation of the House Restaurant and the cafeteria and other food service facilities of the House of Representatives, subject to the authority of the Committee on House Administration * * *."

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: None.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution or the initial funding resolution. However, H. Res. 273, on April 29, 1971, authorized funds for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: None.

Special authority: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—91st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorizations in initial funding resolution: \$40,000 authorized by H. Res. 508 on August 6, 1969.

Subsequent funding: None.

92d Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$43,000 authorized by H. Res. 273 on April 29, 1971; and \$29,500 authorized by H. Res. 948 on June 8, 1972.

93d Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Authorization in subsequent funding resolution: \$33,500 authorized by H. Res. 202 on March 20, 1973; and \$34,500 authorized by H. Res. 768 on April 29, 1974.

Total expenditures: August 1969–December 1974—\$179,917.82.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 91st Congress.

Extensions: Extended to end of 92d Congress by H. Res. 317 on March 25, 1971. Extended to end of 93d Congress by H. Res. 111 on February 7, 1973.

Actual termination: End of 93d Congress. At the beginning of the 94th Congress, the House Committee on House Administration created an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Restaurant.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—During each of three Congresses, the Select Committee was created by voice vote without objection being expressed.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALL ASPECTS OF UNITED STATES MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Date of creation.—June 8, 1970.

Citation.—H. Res. 976; 91st Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 224-101).

Membership.—Number of members: 12. Democrats: 6. Republicans: 6.

Mode of selecting members: The establishing resolution specified that the members of the Select Committee be chosen as follows: "two from the Armed Services Committee, two from the Foreign Affairs Committee, and eight from the House at large * * *," appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was appointed chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was authorized to "immediately proceed to Southeast Asia to investigate all aspects of the United States military involvement in Southeast Asia."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report to the House on the results of its investigation within forty-five days after adoption of the authorizing resolution.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: No.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 976, the establishing resolution, authorized the Select Committee to "appoint and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, and

clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable."

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—91st Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: H. Res. 976 authorized the payment of expenses of the Select Committee from the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Select Committee.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 1071 on June 10, 1970.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: June 10, 1970, to December 31, 1970—\$15,723.68.

Termination.—Original termination date: July 23, 1970.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: Report submitted to the House on July 6, 1970.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—Under the terms of the resolution, the Select Committee was directed to make a fact-finding trip to Southeast Asia and to report to the House within 45 days. Advocates of the resolution urged the need for a source of information, independent of the executive branch, on which Members of Congress could base their assessments and positions. Critics of the proposed Committee asserted that the resolution did not provide sufficient time for a meaningful inquiry and that the House would be better served by a more extended study trip or by public hearings conducted by one of the existing standing committees. Fears were expressed that the adoption of the resolution undermined or ignored the jurisdictions of the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees. Rep. Bingham of New York also advocated that the resolution be amended to ensure that the membership of the Select Committee would reflect the full range of positions taken by Members on the war.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Date of creation.—January 31, 1973.

Citation.—H. Res. 132; 93d Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 282-91).

Membership.—Number of members: 10. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 5.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker as authorized in the establishing resolution: five members from the majority and five from the minority.

Mode of selecting chairman: Designated by the Speaker from among the members of the Select Committee.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study with respect to the operation and implementation of rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, including committee structure of the House, the number and optimum size of committees, their jurisdiction, the number of subcommittees, committee rules

and procedures, media coverage of meetings, staffing, space, equipment, and other committee facilities."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized and "directed to report to the House by bill, resolution, or otherwise, with respect to any matters covered by this resolution."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: None.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 132 authorized the employment of investigators, individual consultants or organizations, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—93d Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: H. Res. 132 authorized \$1,500,000 to be available, one half to the majority and one half to the minority, for the expenses of the Select Committee on Committees.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: \$688,177.44.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 93d Congress.

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: December 20, 1974 (end of 93d Congress).

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—During debate, Rep. Bolling of Missouri pointed out that the resolution creating the Select Committee was unusual in that it provided for an equal division between the parties of members and funds.

We figured out that there was only one way of having any hope of succeeding in the end, and that was to have a most unusual committee, a completely bipartisan committee, and in the process we decided that the only way to make that very clear that that was meaningful—although we certainly do not want to have two separate staffs—was to say in the resolution that the money would be available half-and-half, half to the majority and half to the minority. We were eliminating or hoping to eliminate all partisanship at the very outset.

He also noted that no additional resolution from the Committee on House Administration would be necessary to fund the Committee's activities:

Furthermore, we wanted to be sure that we would be as little influenced as possible by anybody in the institution who might wish to influence us in behalf of his particular jurisdiction. Thus we decided the only way in which we could achieve that would be to bypass the Committee on House Administration. Inevitably, since it is the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee there was no possible way of bypassing that, but to be as free as possible from any undue influence from the inside, we decided to bypass the Committee on House Administration in the expenditure of the money and do it very frankly. I informed the chairman of the committee of the fact and he seemed to feel that it made some sense.

Although all the Members participating in debate agreed on the need for a study of the House committee system, several raised questions about the need for a select committee, agruing that the study could be conducted by either the Committee on Rules or the Committee on House Administration or by the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization. For example, Rep. Anderson of Illinois contended that a Joint Committee inquiry would be "a cheaper and sounder approach" which would also enable the House to act in conjunction with the Senate.

In response, Rep. Bolling emphasized that, unlike the proposed Select Committee, all of the standing committees had partisan majorities as well as other responsibilities which would make it difficult for them to give sufficient time and attention to the proposed study. He was supported by the Minority Leader, Rep. Ford of Michigan, who stressed the desirability of an even partisan division on the Select Committee, which would also include members of many of the standing committees and who would be well informed about their jurisdiction and activities.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING¹

Date of creation.—January 3, 1975.

Citation.—H. Res. 988; 93d Congress, 2d Session (amendment adopted by a recorded vote of 323-84, on October 2, 1974).

Membership.—Not specified in establishing resolution.

Number of members: Not specified in establishing resolution.
94th Congress: 28. Democrats: 19. Republicans: 9. 95th Congress: 34. Democrats: 23. Republicans: 11. 96th Congress: 45. Democrats: 30. Republicans: 15. 97th Congress: 55. Democrats: 32. Republicans: 23.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The permanent Select Committee on Aging is authorized—

“(1) To conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of the older American, including but not limited to income maintenance, housing, health (including medical research), welfare, employment, education, recreation, and participation in family and community life as self-respecting citizens;

“(2) To study the use of all practicable means and methods of encouraging the development of public and private programs and policies which will assist the older American in taking a full part in national life and which will encourage the utilization of the knowledge, skills, special aptitudes, and abilities of older Americans to contribute to a better quality of life for all Americans;

“(3) To develop policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to deal with problems of aging; and

“(4) To review any recommendations made by the President or by the White House Conference on Aging relating to programs or policies affecting older Americans.”

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: Not specified in the establishing resolution. Each House standing committee is required under rule XI, clause 1(d) of the House Rules to submit to the House a report on the activities of that committee no later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year. To date, the House permanent Select Committee on Aging has submitted annual reports to the House for 1975 and 1976

¹ The Select Committee was created by a floor amendment to H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, which added a new section to House Rule X, establishing the Select Committee as a permanent body.

and biennial Activities Reports for the 95th (1977-1978) and 96th (1979-1980) Congresses.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in the establishing resolution. The staffing of the subcommittees was accomplished in accordance with the House rules authorizing the employment of two professional staff members for each subcommittee. The full Committee employs a staff director, a counsel, a chief investigator, a gerontologist and experts and clerical assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorization and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$600,000 authorized by H. Res. 287 on March 21, 1975.

Subsequent funding: \$580,000 authorized by H. Res. 1047 on March 9, 1976.

95th Congress: Subsequent funding: \$787,625 authorized by H. Res. 382 on March 22, 1977. \$985,891 authorized by H. Res. 1021 on March 10, 1978.

96th Congress: \$1,050,000 as authorized by H. Res. 128 on March 22, 1979.

Subsequent funding: \$1,233,000 as authorized by H. Res. 565 on February 28, 1980.

97th Congress: \$1,233,000 as authorized by H. Res. 115 on March 25, 1981.

Total expenditures: January 1975 to September 30, 1981: \$5,438,159.53.

Total authorizations: January 1975 to January 2, 1982: \$6,429,516.

Termination.—The Select Committee is a permanent Select Committee.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was created by a floor amendment offered by Rep. Young of Florida to H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. Approved by a vote of 323 to 84, the amendment added a new section to House Rule X, establishing the Select Committee as a permanent body.

In support of his amendment, Rep. Young argued that jurisdiction over programs affecting elderly Americans was fragmented among seven or more standing committees and that the House should create a counterpart to the Senate Special Committee on Aging, which had been established in 1961. In opposition, Reps. Brademas of Indiana and Dent of Pennsylvania asserted that the responsibilities proposed for the Select Committee were already being fulfilled by an existing subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Rep. Brademas also argued that oversight responsibilities should not be separated from the authority to report legislation, and that creation of the Select Committee would set an unfortunate precedent:

Passage of this amendment could set a precedent for a proliferation of other similar select committees in a wide variety of fields.

For examples, we could have proposals to establish a Select Committee on Consumer Products; a Select Committee on Energy; a Select Committee on Transportation. All one has to do is enumerate the variety of the problems with which we as legislators are faced, and to consider the attention that may at any given moment in the life of the country be focused on a particular area, to understand that by creating this kind of committee in this particular field, we will only set a precedent for making possible one select committee after another.

H. Res. 988, including the provision creating the Select Committee, became effective on January 3, 1975.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ¹

Date of creation.—February 19, 1975 and July 17, 1975.

Citation.—H. Res. 138; 94th Congress, 1st Session (adopted on a recorded vote of 286-120). H. Res. 591; 94th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 10 (increased to 13 by H. Res. 591). Democrats: 6 (increased to 9). Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The House Select Committee on Intelligence was established "to conduct an inquiry into the organization, operations, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States Government." The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry into—

"(1) The collection, analysis, use, and cost of intelligence information and allegations of illegal or improper activities of intelligence agencies in the United States and abroad;

"(2) The procedures and effectiveness of coordination among and between the various intelligence components of the United States Government;

"(3) The nature and extent of executive branch oversight and control of United States intelligence activities;

"(4) The need for improved or reorganized oversight by the Congress of the United States intelligence activities;

"(5) The necessity, nature, and extent of overt and covert intelligence activities by United States intelligence instrumentalities in the United States and abroad;

"(6) The procedures for and means of the protection of sensitive intelligence information;

"(7) Procedures for and means of the protection of rights and privileges of citizens of the United States from illegal or improper intelligence activities; and

"(8) Such other related matters as the select committee shall deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution."

In carrying out the purposes of the establishing resolutions the Select Committee on Intelligence was further "authorized to inquire into the activities of the following:

"(1) the National Security Council;

"(2) the United States Intelligence Board;

"(3) the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board;

"(4) the Central Intelligence Agency;

¹ On July 17, 1975, the House abolished the first Select Committee on Intelligence established by H. Res. 138, and created a second Select Committee on Intelligence with the same mandate, but with its membership increased by three.

- "(5) the Defense Intelligence Agency;
- "(6) the intelligence components of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force;
- "(7) the National Security Agency;
- "(8) the Intelligence and Research Bureau of the Department of State;
- "(9) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
- "(10) the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice;
- "(11) the Energy Research and Development Administration; and
- "(12) any other instrumentalities of the United States Government engaged in or otherwise responsible for intelligence operations in the United States and abroad."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The House Select Committee on Intelligence was "authorized and directed to report to the House with respect to the matters covered * * * as soon as practicable but no later than January 31, 1976." The establishing resolution also stated that the authority granted to the Select Committee "shall expire three months after the filing of the report with the House of Representatives." On January 29, 1976, the House adopted H. Res. 982 by a vote of 246 to 129, which reversed the decision of the Select Committee to make its final report public, and prohibited the release of the report so long as it contained information that the President believed would jeopardize the national security. The resolution directed that "the Select Committee on Intelligence shall not release any report containing materials, information, data, or subjects that presently bear security classification, unless and until such reports are published with appropriate security markings and distributed only to persons authorized to receive such classified information, or until the report has been certified by the President as not containing information which would adversely affect the intelligence activities of the CIA in foreign countries or the intelligence activities in foreign countries of any other department or agency of the Federal Government. The resolution also authorized the Select Committee to file a supplemental report containing its recommendations by midnight on Wednesday, February 11, 1976.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The establishing resolutions (H. Res. 138 and 591) authorized the Select Committee to employ "investigators, attorneys, consultants, or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance." Access to classified information was limited to employees with appropriate security clearances as determined by the Select Committee. The resolution also prohibited any staff member from accepting any "honorarium, royalty, or other payment for a speaking engagement, magazine article, book, or other endeavor connected with the investigation and study undertaken" by the House Select Committee on Intelligence.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: Section 6 of the establishing resolution authorized the Select Committee to "institute and carry out such

rules and procedures as it may deem necessary to prevent: (1) The disclosure, outside the select committee, of any information relating to the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other department or agency of the Federal Government engaged in intelligence activities, obtained by the select committee during the course of its study and investigation, not authorized by the select committee to be disclosed; and (2) the disclosure, outside the select committee, of any information which would adversely affect the intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in foreign countries or the Intelligence activities in foreign countries of any other department or agency of the Federal Government."

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: \$750,000 authorized by H. Res. 138 and transferred by H. Res. 591.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: No subsequent funding.

Total expenditures: February 19, 1975–February 11, 1976—\$444,436.46.

Termination.—Original termination date: The Select Committee was authorized to submit a report by January 31, 1976. The authority granted the Select Committee was to expire three months after the report was filed.

Extensions: H. Res. 982 on January 29, 1976, granted the Select Committee until February 11, 1976, to file a supplemental report containing its recommendations.

Actual termination: February 11, 1976, report submitted to House.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—During debate on the resolution which first established the Select Committee, no objection was heard to the need for the investigation mandated by the resolution. Some Members stated that they would have preferred that a joint committee be established for the purpose, but given that a Senate Select Committee had already been created, they recognized that this alternative was no longer practical. Rep. Giaimo of Connecticut supported the need for a House Select Committee by noting that the jurisdiction specified in the resolution would otherwise be divided among seven or more standing committees and subcommittees.

Four amendments to the resolution were offered by Rep. Anderson of Illinois, two of which were accepted by Rep. Murphy of Illinois on behalf of the Committee on Rules. These amendments imposed: (1) More specific requirements regarding the handling of sensitive information; and (2) a ceiling of \$750,000 on the Select Committee's expenses. Defeated were amendments to reduce the time available to the Select Committee for its investigation and to require that its membership be evenly divided between the two parties.

Five months later, the House considered another resolution to abolish the Select Committee and then to re-create it with the same mandate and authority but with a membership of thirteen instead of ten. Rep. Bolling asserted that an impasse among the Select Committee's members had effectively stymied its investigation, and that increasing its membership would give the Speaker "additional flexibility as to personalities and numbers."

During consideration of the second resolution, an amendment was defeated which would have abolished the Select Committee without then re-creating it. In support of this amendment, the Minority Leader, Rep. Rhodes, contended that insufficient time remained for an adequate investigation and that the House should not duplicate the inquiries of both a Senate Select Committee and a Presidential commission. Also defeated amid extensive debate in Committee of the Whole were: (1) An amendment by Rep. Anderson to provide instead for a joint committee, the House Members of which would serve as an ad hoc committee until the Senate concurred in the House action; (2) amendments by Rep. Latta of Ohio to reduce the size of the Select Committee from thirteen to seven and to restrict its mandate to the activities of the CIA only; and (3) an amendment by Rep. Moss of California providing that all members of the Select Committee created by the first resolution could, at their discretion, continue to serve on its successor.

AD HOC SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Date of creation.—April 22, 1975.

Citation.—H. Res. 412; 94th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 97; 95th Congress, 1st Session, January 11, 1977 (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 16 (increased to 19 by the Speaker on May 6, 1975). Democrats: 1 (increased to 13). Republicans: 5 (increased to 6).

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker from the following committees: (1) The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; (2) the Committee on the Judiciary; (3) the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. Res. 97 which reauthorized the Committee for the 95th Congress, also specified that the Select Committee be composed of "other members from other committees as the Speaker may appoint so as to insure the expeditious consideration and reporting of appropriate legislation."

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The ad hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf was authorized to consider and report to the House on H.R. 6218 (H.R. 1614), "a bill to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf; to protect the marine and coastal environment, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; and for other purposes, and on any related matter on this subject within the jurisdiction * * *" of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Judiciary which may be referred to it by the Speaker.

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: The ad hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf was originally directed to transmit its findings and make a full report to the House on January 31, 1976. The reporting date was extended to March 31, 1976, by H. Res. 977 and to May 4, 1976, by H. Res. 1121. H. Res. 97 reestablished the Select Committee and extended its reporting date to the end of the first session of the 95th Congress "upon completion of the legislative

process, including final disposition of any veto message, with respect to all legislation reported by the Committee." (H. Res. 97, 95th Congress, 1st Session, January 11, 1977 p. 3) Extended to January 3, 1979 by H. Res. 1045 on April 4, 1978.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The establishing resolution authorized the Select Committee to "utilize the services of the staffs of those standing committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the Select Committee."

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: Section 2 of the establishing resolution provides that "[I]nsofar as applicable, the provisions of rule XI, clauses 1 and 2 shall apply to the Select Committee." Rule XI of the Rules of the House relate to the rules of procedures for standing committees, and clauses 1 and 2 focus on the following: adoption of written rules for committees, regular meeting days, additional and special meetings, absence of chairman, committee records, open meetings and hearings, quorum for taking testimony and certain other actions, prohibition against committee meetings during five minute rule, calling and interrogation of witnesses, investigative hearing procedures, committee procedures for reporting bills and resolutions, power to sit and act, subpoena power, and use of committee funds for travel.

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$150,000 authorized by H. Res. 427 on May 22, 1975.

Subsequent funding: \$150,000 authorized by H. Res. 1021 on March 9, 1976. \$89,000 authorized by H. Res. 1414 on August 26, 1976.

95th Congress Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: \$315,000 authorized by H. Res. 343 on March 22, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$300,000 as authorized by H. Res. 1045 on April 4, 1978.

Total expenditures: April 22, 1975, to January 3, 1979: \$880,516.87.

Total authorizations: April 1975 to January 2, 1979: \$1,004,000.

Termination.—Original termination date: January 31, 1976.

Extensions: Extended to March 31, 1976 by H. Res. 977 on January 26, 1976. Extended to May 4, 1976, by H. Res. 1121 on March 31, 1976. Extended to the end of the 95th Congress, 1st Session by H. Res. 97 on January 11, 1977. Upon submission of the final report of the Committee, it is authorized to continue until completion of the legislative process, "including final disposition of any veto message, with respect to all legislation reported by the Committee." Extended to January 3, 1979 by H. Res. 1045 on April 4, 1978.

Actual termination. End of 95th Congress (January 3, 1979).¹

Principal issues regarding creation of the committee.—The ad hoc Select Committee was the first such committee to be established

¹ The Ad Hoc Select Committee on Outer Continental Shelf was succeeded by the Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf as established in 1979. (See page 93).

pursuant to the provision of H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, authorizing creation of special ad hoc committees to consider a bill or other matter which would otherwise fall within the jurisdiction of several standing committees. The rule requires that ad hoc committees include members of the appropriate standing committees, and the Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf was so constituted.

Creation of the Committee in the 94th and 95th Congresses elicited little debate and no controversy. During consideration of H. Res. 412 in 1975, Rep. Murphy of New York asserted that establishment of the Committee would "prevent major jurisdictional problems" involving six or more standing committees. When the Committee was re-created in 1977, Rep. Murphy stated that it had functioned successfully and that much of its work had been completed. Members of the minority sought and received assurances that the composition of the Committee would remain essentially unchanged.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF UNITED STATES
SERVICEMEN MISSING IN ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Date of creation.—September 11, 1975.

Citation.—H. Res. 335; 94th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 394-3).

Membership.—Number of members: 10. Democrats: 7, Republicans: 3.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was "authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of—

"(1) The problem of United States servicemen still identified as missing in action, as well as those known dead whose bodies have not been recovered, as a result of military operations in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and the problem of United States civilians identified as missing or unaccounted for, as well as those known dead whose bodies have not been recovered in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia;

"(2) The need for additional international inspection teams to determine whether there are servicemen still held as prisoners of war or civilians held captive or unwillingly detained in the aforementioned areas."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was directed to submit a report to the House with respect to the results of its investigation as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the adoption of the resolution establishing it (September 11, 1976). Extended to January 3, 1977 by H. Res. 1454 on August 2, 1976.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 412 specified that the Select Committee was "authorized to employ and fix compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary." The Select Commit-

tee was authorized to reimburse staff members for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties other than expenses in connection with meetings of the Select Committee held in Washington, D.C.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The Select Committee and its staff were authorized to conduct field hearings and investigations and to travel to Southeast Asia if necessary.

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None. The establishing resolution directed that the expenses of the Select Committee be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Select Committee and approved by the Speaker.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$350,000 authorized by H. Res. 744 on October 9, 1975.

Subsequent funding: None.

Total expenditures: September 11, 1975 to December 31, 1976—\$174,300.43.

Termination.—Original termination date: The Select Committee was directed to report not later than one year after adoption of the establishing resolution (September 11, 1976). The authority of the Select Committee was scheduled to expire ninety days after submission of the final report.

Extensions: Extended to January 3, 1977, by H. Res. 1454 on August 2, 1976.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on December 13, 1976. Authority of Select Committee expired on March 13, 1977.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution creating the Select Committee was adopted on a record vote with only three Members in opposition, none of whom participated in debate. No opposition was expressed, although several Members indicated that it was not their normal practice to support the creation of select committees.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

Date of creation.—May 18, 1976.

Citation.—H. Res. 1186; 94th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 13. Democrats: 7. Republicans: 6.

Mode of selecting members: The Select Committee was composed of 13 members who were chosen as specified in H. Res. 1186, seven from the major'ty party and six from the minority party.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker from among the members of the Select Committee.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee on Professional Sports was authorized "to conduct an inquiry into the need for legislation with respect to professional sports."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was directed to report to the House on the results of its inquiry as soon as practicable during the 94th Congress.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: Not specified in establishing resolution. H. Res. 1408, on August 26, 1976, authorized funds for the employment of clerical and other assistants, and for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authority: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 1408 on August 26, 1976.

95th Congress: Subsequent funding: \$30,000 authorized by H. Res. 436 on March 31, 1977.

Total expenditures: May 18, 1976, to December 31, 1976—\$8,835.80.

Termination.—Original termination: End of 94th Congress.

Extensions: None. On January 13, 1977, Mr. Sisk and others introduced H. Res. 111, a resolution to reestablish the Select Committee on Professional Sports for the 95th Congress. The House Committee on Rules reported favorably on this resolution on March 3, 1977. However, on March 7, 1977, the measure was rejected by the House on a rollcall vote of 75-271.

Actual termination: Final report submitted to the House on January 3, 1977.

Principal issues regarding creation of the committee.—When the Select Committee was created in 1976, no opposition was heard, in part because its prospective chairman, Rep. Sisk of California, stated that no funds would be requested for Committee expenses. The Committee subsequently requested and received a modest sum for clerical support and supplies.

The resolution to re-create the Select Committee for the 95th Congress differed from H. Res. 1186 in that it specified some of the matters which the Committee was expected to study, including existing antitrust exemptions. As a result, the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee objected to what they argued would be an invasion of the jurisdictions of their committee and other standing committees which would otherwise have jurisdiction. Rep. Rodino of New Jersey asserted that:

The matters within the scope of the select committee's requested authority are all matters squarely within the rule X jurisdiction of existing standing committees of the House. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of the committee system is severely compromised if a select committee is created every time a new issue surfaces in the press. Oversight by standing committees becomes meaningless, the prospect of legislation becomes delayed, and the expertise nurtured and developed by the standing committees is squandered. At a time when the public expects a tightening of the belt and a heightened sense of congressional responsibility, I cannot imagine sanctioning the creation of a select committee to pursue matters within the jurisdiction of at least four standing committees of the House.

Members of the Select Committee emphasized that it could only make recommendations and that the legislative authority of the standing committees remained intact. In reply, opponents of the

resolution pointed to the recommendations already made by the Select Committee, and argued that re-creation of the Committee would only postpone legislative action by the standing committees on these recommendations.

The resolution to reestablish the Select Committee was rejected by a vote of 75 to 271.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Date of creation.—July 29, 1976.

Citation.—H. Res. 1350; 94th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 361-10). H. Res. 77; 95th Congress, 1st Session, January 11, 1977 (adopted by a voice vote). H. Res. 13, 96th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 338-75). H. Res. 13, 97th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 276-101).

Membership.—Number of members: 18. Democrats: 12. Republicans: 6.

96th Congress: Decreased to 17 by H. Res. 13. Democrats: 11. Republicans: 6.

97th Congress: Increased to 19 by H. Res. 13. Democrats: 11. Republicans: 8.

Mode of selecting members: The establishing resolution specified that the members of the Select Committee be appointed by the Speaker and that at least one member be chosen from each by the following committees: The Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated to serve as chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control was authorized: "(1) To conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of narcotics abuse and control, including, but not limited to, international trafficking, enforcement, prevention, narcotics-related violations of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, international treaties, organized crime, drug abuse in the Armed Forces of the United States, treatment and rehabilitation, and the approach of the criminal justice system with respect to narcotics law violations and crimes related to drug abuse; and (2) to review any recommendations made by the President, or by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, relating to programs or policies affecting narcotics abuse or control."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None to date.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee was directed to submit an annual report to the House summarizing its activities and to submit additional reports on the results of its investigations.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee was authorized to "employ and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, attorneys, investigators, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it considers necessary * * *." The Select

Committee was also authorized to reimburse staff members for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the performance of their duties, excluding expenses in connection with meetings of the Select Committee in the District of Columbia.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The Select Committee was authorized to hold field hearings and inspections.

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$111,667 was authorized by H. Res. 1472 on September 2, 1976.

Subsequent funding: None.

95th Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: \$722,204 was authorized by H. Res. 239 on March 9, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$722,204 as authorized by H. Res. 1004 on February 15, 1978.

96th Congress: \$700,000 as authorized by H. Res. 174 on April 5, 1979.

Subsequent funding: \$600,000 as authorized by H. Res. 572 on March 11, 1980.

97th Congress: \$551,173 as authorized by H. Res. 115 on March 25, 1981.

Total expenditures: July 1976 to September 30, 1981: \$2,651,293.28.

Total authorizations: July 1976 to January 2, 1982: \$3,407,248.

Termination.—Original termination date: Not specified in establishing resolution:

Extensions: Reauthorized by H. Res. 77 on January 11, 1977, for the 95th Congress. Reauthorized by H. Res. 13 on March 21, 1979, for the 96th Congress. Reauthorized by H. Res. 13 on February 25, 1981, for the 97th Congress.

Actual termination: Still in existence.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established in 1976 and reestablished in 1977 without opposition being expressed on the House floor. During debate on H. Res. 1350, Rep. Murphy of Illinois emphasized that the Select Committee would serve as a coordinating and investigative mechanism for the House. In response to an inquiry by Rep. Rodino of New Jersey, Rep. Murphy assured the House that the Committee would coordinate its efforts and consult frequently with the seven or more standing committees with some jurisdiction over narcotics and drug abuse. In this regard, he pointed to the provision of the resolution which specified that the membership of the Select Committee must include members of each such standing committee.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AND THE DEATH OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

(Also known as the Select Committee on Assassinations)

Date of creation.—September 17, 1976.

Citation.—H. Res. 1540; 94th Congress, 2d Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 280-65). H. Res. 222; 95th Congress, 1st Session, February 2, 1977 (adopted by recorded vote of 237-164). H. Res. 433, 95th Congress, 1st Session, March 30, 1977 (adopted by recorded vote of 230-181).

Membership.—Number of members: 12. Democrats: 8. Republicans: 4.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was authorized to "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the death of John F. Kennedy and the death of Martin Luther King, Junior, and of any others the select committee shall determine".

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: H. Res. 222, which reauthorized the Select Committee for the 95th Congress, expanded its jurisdiction to include an "investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the assassination and death of President John F. Kennedy and the assassination and death of Martin Luther King, Junior, and of any other persons the select committee shall determine might be related to either death in order to ascertain: (1) Whether the existing laws relating to the safety and protection of the President of the United States, assassinations of the President of the United States, deprivation of civil rights, and conspiracies related thereto, as well as the investigatory jurisdiction and capability of agencies and departments of the United States Government, are adequate either in their provisions or in the manner of their enforcement; and (2) whether there was full disclosure and sharing of information and evidence among agencies and departments of the United States Government during the course of all prior investigations into those deaths; and whether any evidence or information which was not in the possession of any agency or department of the United States Government investigating either death would have been of assistance to that agency or department, and why such information was not provided to or collected by the appropriate agency or department; and shall make recommendations to the House, if the select committee deems it appropriate, for the amendments of existing legislation or the enactment of new legislation." H. Res. 222 also directed that the Select Committee adopt written rules of procedure consistent with the House Rules and the establishing resolution.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The establishing resolution directed the Select Committee to submit a report to the House on the results of its investigation as soon as practicable during the 94th Congress. H. Res. 222 extended the life of the Select Committee to March 31,

1977. On March 30, 1977, the House approved H. Res. 433 which extended the life of the Select Committee for the duration of the 95th Congress. On January 18, 1979 the House adopted H. Res. 49, a measure which included a provision that "any unexpended balance of funds from the second session of the 95th Congress for the operation of the former Select Committee on Assassinations shall be available to the Clerk of the House for the purpose of completing the final report of such committee not later than March 31, 1979."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee was authorized to "employ and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, attorneys, investigators, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it considers necessary * * *." The Select Committee was authorized to reimburse staff members for travel, subsistence, and other expenses as necessary in the performance of their duties, excluding expenses for Select Committee meetings held in Washington, D.C.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The Select Committee was authorized by H. Res. 222 to "take testimony on oath anywhere within the United States or in any other country and to authorize designated counsel for the select committee to obtain statements from any witness who is placed under oath by an authority who is authorized to administer oaths in accordance with the applicable laws of the United States or of any State * * *." The chairman of the Select Committee was authorized to establish subcommittees as he considered appropriate. H. Res. 222 also specified that "[T]he select committee shall be considered a committee of the House of Representatives for all purposes of law, including but not limited to section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192); and sections 6002 and 6005 of title 18, United States Code, or any other Act of Congress regulating the granting of immunity to witnesses."

Authorizations and expenditures.—94th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$150,000 authorized by H. Res. 1557 on September 30, 1976.

Subsequent funding: None.

95th Congress: Authorization in reestablishing resolution: None.

Subsequent funding: \$2,514,400 authorized by H. Res. 465 on April 28, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$2,500,000 as authorized by H. Res. 956 on March 13, 1978. \$790,000 as authorized by H. Res. 1276 on September 14, 1978.

Total expenditures: September 1976 to January 3, 1979: \$5,289,969.39.

Total authorizations: September 1976 to January 2, 1979: \$5,954,400.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 94th Congress.

Extensions: Extended to March 31, 1977, by H. Res. 222 on February 2, 1977. Extended to the end of the 95th Congress by H. Res. 433 on March 30, 1977 (January 3, 1979). Summary of Findings and Recommendations (H. Rept. 95-1828) submitted December 29, 1978.

Final reporting date extended to March 31, 1979 by H. Res. 49 on January 18, 1979. Final Report (H. Rept. 1828-95-pt. 2) filed with the Clerk of the House on March 29, 1979.

Actual termination: January 3, 1979.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established during the closing days of the 94th Congress to investigate questions relating to the assassinations of President Kennedy and Reverend King. During debate, several Members expressed the expectation that the Committee would be re-established during the 95th Congress. Although other Members asserted that the proposed investigations would be either futile or unnecessary, the resolution was adopted by a record vote of 280 to 65.

During the remaining months of 1976, a number of issues arose regarding the Committee's operations and personnel, including its budget and expenses, the role and activities of its staff, and its investigative procedures. With these matters in mind, the House adopted H. Res. 222, which re-created the Committee for a period of several months only, during which it was expected to resolve any subjects in dispute. During debate on this resolution, criticisms were again expressed that the investigation was unlikely to be productive and that the House would be better served by concentrating on more current issues. Rep. Anderson of Illinois also noted that the resolution expanded the Committee's mandate by directing it to inquire into the adequacy and administration of certain laws:

This language says in effect that the Select Committee shall determine the adequacy of existing laws and agency enforcement efforts and cooperation with respect to the matters under investigation, and report back any proposals for change in present law or legislation. This language is necessitated by numerous Supreme Court decisions that any congressional inquiry must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of Congress. And I cite here, *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957), and *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109 (1959).

One day before the Committee's mandate was due to expire under H. Res. 222, the House took up H. Res. 433, to continue the Committee for the duration of the 95th Congress. As in the case of H. Res. 222, the resolution was considered by the House as in Committee of the Whole so that amendments to the resolution would be in order. Some Members alleged that the Select Committee was in disarray; others contended that all problems had been resolved and that the investigations could proceed productively. An amendment offered by Rep. Bauman of Maryland was adopted, deleting a provision authorizing the Select Committee "to bring, defend, and intervene in lawsuits and make applications to courts." Rep. Bauman argued that any such actions should be taken only with the consent of the full House.

After extended debate, and rejection of Rep. Bauman's motion that the House resolve itself into secret session to receive additional information which could not be made public, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 230 to 181.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Date of creation.—March 9, 1977.

Citation.—H. Res. 383; 95th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 410-1).

Membership.—Number of members: 19. Democrats: 13. Republicans: 6.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee on Ethics was authorized to "consider and * * * report to the House on any bills or resolutions which may include provisions incorporating and integrating into permanent law applicable provisions and appropriate modifications of rule XLIII, rule XLIV, rule XLV, rule XLVI, and rule XLVII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and which may hereafter be referred to the Select Committee by the Speaker. The Select Committee shall have jurisdiction over the bills and resolutions referred to it." The Select Committee was also authorized "to adopt regulations, and issue advisory opinions, regarding the application of rules XLIII-XLVII of the Rules of the House."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: The establishing resolution specified that the authority of the Select Committee on Ethics to report bills and resolutions referred to it shall expire on September 30, 1977. The Select Committee is scheduled to expire on December 31, 1977. Its records will be transferred to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee on Ethics was authorized to utilize the services of the staffs of House committees and commissions. H. Res. 428 also provided funds for the employment of professional and clerical staff, and individual consultants or organizations.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authority: Whenever appropriate, clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the House rules apply to the Select Committee on Ethics. Rule XI governs rules of procedures for House committees generally and clauses 1, 2, and 3 relate to committee rules, committee records, and broadcasting of committee hearings.

Authorizations and expenditures.—95th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$283,000 authorized by H. Res. 428 on March 31, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$114,000 as authorized by H. Res. 971 on February 15, 1978.

Total expenditures: January 1977 to January 3, 1979: \$266,191.91.

Total authorizations: January 1977 to January 2, 1979: \$397,000.

Termination.—Original termination date: The authority to report bills and resolutions expired on September 30, 1977. The establishing resolution specified that the Select Committee shall adopt regulations necessary for the application of rules XLIII-XLVII by December 1, 1977. The Select Committee on Ethics was scheduled to expire on December 31, 1977.

Extensions: Extended until "completion of its official business", by H. Res. 871 on October 31, 1977.

Actual termination: Final Report (H. Rept. 95-1837) submitted to the House on January 3, 1979.

Principal issues regarding creation of the committee.—This Select Committee was established to promulgate regulations implementing House rules regarding ethics and conduct and to recommend legislation enacting these rules into law. Creation of the Select Committee followed adoption of H. Res. 287, recommended and expanded these rules.

In support of the resolution, Rep. Bolling of Missouri noted that five standing committees would otherwise have legitimate jurisdictional claims, and that legislative action would be expedited and simplified by creation of the Select Committee. According to Rep. Rodino of New Jersey, "[i]n these circumstances, establishing a select committee and giving it exclusive, narrow legislative jurisdiction will not duplicate effort, will not delay legislation and need not squander the expertise of standing committees." He noted "the intent of the leadership to appoint as members of the select committee individuals who can draw upon the very expertise already developed in this area by the regular committee structure."

Critics of the resolution wished to defeat the previous question so that amendments could be offered to provide for audits of House accounts, to change the rules governing subsequent investigations by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, to enable the House to review and reject regulations proposed by the Select Committee, and to make the partisan balance on the Select Committee more nearly equal. Rep. Bolling rejected these proposals as being either untimely, impractical, or inappropriate.

No objection was made to the principles of enacting legislation to govern congressional ethics or of creating a Select Committee with legislative authority for this purpose.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Date of creation.—March 28, 1977.

Citation.—H. Res. 420; 95th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 211-147).

Membership.—Number of members: 7. Democrats: 5. Republicans: 2.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was authorized to continue the work of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations for the House, by:

"(1) Making a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and recommending improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, developing cooperation between the Houses of Congress, improving its relationship with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

"(2) Identifying any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the select committee, is of vital interest to the Congress, or to the House of Representatives as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government, and calling such proceeding or action to the attention of the House.

"(3) Conducting a continuing study of the jurisdiction of the various standing committees of the House of Representatives and their relative workloads, and of ways of rationalizing committee jurisdictions between the two Houses of Congress, and reporting to the Committee on Rules any recommendations on the more equitable distribution of workload or the more rational combination of jurisdictional responsibilities."

The Select Committee on Congressional Operations is directed to "avoid conflict or duplication with the activities of other committees, commissions, or other entities established by the House."

The Select Committee is also authorized to "supervise and control the functions, as they relate to the House, of the Office of Placement and Office Management established by section 406 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None. H. Res. 420 provides that nothing in the resolution except as specifically provided in subsection (a)(3) "shall be construed to authorize the Select Committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of the House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of the House, nor shall anything * * * be construed to authorize the Select Committee to operate or supervise a permanent system for the broadcast coverage of the proceedings of the House without the express and prior approval of the House."

Authority to report: The Select Committee was authorized to report its recommendations on "the more equitable distribution of workload or the more rational combination of jurisdictional responsibilities."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee was authorized by H. Res. 420:

"(1) To appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform their duties, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

"(2) To prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

"(3) To fix the pay of not more than two members of such staff at rates of pay specified in clause 6(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and to fix the pay of other staff at rates not to exceed the lower rate of pay specified in clause 6(c) of such rule XI:

"(4) To terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

"(5) To reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee, or a subcom-

mittee thereof held in the District of Columbia, except that nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to authorize the members of the staff of the select committee to travel outside the continental United States."

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The provisions of rule XI, clauses 1, 2, and 3, whenever applicable, shall apply to the Select Committee. The Select Committee is directed to adopt written rules of procedure which shall not be inconsistent with the House rules.

Authorizations and expenditures.—95th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$440,000 authorized by H. Res. 489 on May 2, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$900,000 as authorized by H. Res. 985 on April 4, 1978.

Total expenditures: May 1977 to January 3, 1979: \$1,575,688.28.¹

Total authorizations: May 1977 to January 2, 1979: \$1,340,000.¹

Termination.—Original termination date: Not specified. January 3, 1979. On March 27, 1979 the House Rules Committee held hearings on H. Res. 71, a resolution to amend the House Rules and reestablish the Select Committee on Congressional Operations as a permanent select committee. A motion to report the measure was defeated. As a result, the Select Committee was not reconstituted in any form and its functions were performed under the jurisdictions of the House Administration Committee and the newly created Select Committee on Committees (Patterson Committee).

Extensions: None.

Actual termination: January 3, 1979.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The Select Committee was established to continue the functions relating to the House which had been performed by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. The Joint Committee, created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, had been effectively disbanded when the Senate adopted S. Res. 4, the Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977, which made no provision for Senators to serve as members. Later in 1977, the Joint Committee was formally abolished by legislation amending the 1970 Act.

Supporters of the Select Committee asserted that the Joint Committee had performed useful functions, that its activities had been directed primarily toward the House, and that the Select Committee would insure that these functions and activities would continue. They also emphasized that, in effect, the Select Committee was already in place and that no additional staff, funds, or space would be required.

Opponents of the resolution pointed to the limited mandate of the proposed Select Committee, and the requirement that it "shall at all times avoid conflict or duplication with the activities of other committees, commissions, or other entities established by the

¹ Total committee expenditures exceeded total committee authorizations by \$235,688.28. This is because of overlap in expenses incurred during the transition period between the dissolution of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and the establishment of the House Select Committee on Congressional Operations.

House," and its lack of authority to make recommendations regarding House rules. Consequently, it was argued, the Select Committee was precluded from considering the most important aspects of House operations, including committee jurisdictions. Moreover, opponents cited the possibility that the Select Committee's functions might soon be significantly undermined or otherwise affected by the anticipated recommendations of the House's Commission Administrative Review. Finally, Rep. Anderson of Illinois noted that the membership of the Joint Committee had been almost evenly divided between the two political parties.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ENERGY

Date of creation.—April 21, 1977.

Citation.—H. Res. 508; 95th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a voice vote).

Membership.—Number of members: 37 (increased to 40 by H. Res. 509). Democrats: 25 (increased to 27). Republicans: 12 (increased to 13).

Mode of selecting members: H. Res. 508 directed that the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy be composed of members appointed by the Speaker "from those committees of the House which he determines have subject-matter jurisdiction over the substance of the President's Message, and from such other committees as the Speaker may determine so as to insure the expeditious consideration and reporting of appropriate legislation."

Mode of selecting chairman: One of the members of the Select Committee was designated chairman by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The Ad Hoc Committee on Energy was authorized "to consider and report to the House on the Message of the President dated April 20, 1977 (H. Doc. 95-128), on other messages or communications related thereto, and on any bill or resolution which the Speaker may sequentially refer thereto which the Speaker determines relates to the substance of the President's Message: *Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not preclude initial reference to the ad hoc Committee of a bill or resolution incorporating the recommendations of the committees with subject-matter jurisdiction over the substance of the President's Message."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: The Ad Hoc Committee was authorized to report to the House by bill or otherwise and shall expire "upon completion of the legislative process, including final disposition of any veto message, with respect to all legislation referred to the ad hoc Committee."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Ad Hoc Committee on Energy was authorized by H. Res. 508 to "utilize the services of the staffs of those committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the ad hoc Committee." H. Res. 531, the initial funding resolution, on May 26, 1977, authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, consultants, and clerical and other assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified by establishing resolution.

Special authorities: None.

Authorizations and expenditures.—95th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$212,833 authorized by H. Res. 531 on May 26, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$90,000 as authorized by H. Res. 1051 on April 4, 1978. \$50,000 as authorized by H. Res. 1237 on September 11, 1978.

Total expenditures: April 1977 to December 1978: \$220,247.51. veto message, with respect to all legislation referred to the Ad Hoc Committee. Action on primary legislation with which the Ad Hoc Committee concerned was not completed by January 3, 1978. Accordingly, funds for the Ad Hoc Committee were appropriated for the 2d Session of the 95th Congress (H. Res. 1051 and H. Res. 1237).

Report submitted on December 29, 1978.¹

Total authorizations: April 1977 to January 2, 1979: \$325,833.

Termination.—Original termination date: Not specified in establishing resolution; however, the funding resolution stipulated that the authorization granted to the Committee would expire just prior to noon on January 3, 1978. However H. Res. 508, directed that the Energy Committee was to "expire upon completion of the legislative process, including final disposition of any report.

Extensions: Extended to the end of the 95th Congress (H. Res. 1051 and H. Res. 1237).

Actual termination: End of 95th Congress. January 3, 1979.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—Although several Members indicated that they would have preferred alternative arrangements for the consideration of energy legislation, the resolution creating the ad hoc committee was adopted by voice vote without any Member expressing opposition or serious reservation. Debate on the resolution was devoted in large part to statements and colloquies intended to clarify the functions of the Select Committee as a coordinating mechanism and its relationship with the standing committees of jurisdiction. A number of Members expressed concern that their rights and prerogatives of the committees on which they served would be protected when the expected energy bill was considered on the House floor and, if necessary, by a House-Senate conference committee.

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Date of creation.—July 14, 1977.

Citation.—H. Res. 658; 95th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 229-169).

Membership.—Number of members: 13. Democrats: 9. Republicans: 4. Increased to 14 by H. Res. 70, 96th Congress, 1st Session (January 25, 1979).

¹ On March 25, 1980, the House, by a 282 to 125 vote, rejected the creation of a new energy committee. It did vote, 300 to 111, to enhance the energy jurisdiction already within in the purview of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which was redesignated Committee on Energy and Commerce at the beginning of the 97th Congress.

Mode of selecting members: The thirteen members of the Select Committee shall include at least one member from the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on the Judiciary. The establishing resolution specified that the majority and minority leaders of the House be ex officio members of the Select Committee but shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum. Service on the Select Committee is limited to six years, exclusive of service during the 95th Congress. Beginning with the 97th Congress and every Congress thereafter, at least four of the members appointed to the Committee shall be Members with no previous service on the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mode of selecting the chairman: Not specified in establishing resolution; however, all Select Committee appointments are made by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: The House Select Committee on Intelligence, established in accordance with H. Res. 591 on July 17, 1975, recommended that the House establish a permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with legislative, budgetary, and supervisory authority over all foreign and domestic intelligence gathering activities of the United States Government. H. Res. 658 established the House Permanent Select Committee to oversee, make continuing studies, and reports to the House (by legislation or otherwise) appropriate proposals concerning the intelligence and intelligence-related programs and activities of the United States Government.

The Select Committee was authorized to consider "all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following:

"(1) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of Central Intelligence.

"(2) Intelligence and intelligence-related activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and other agencies of the Department of Defense; the Department of State; the Department of Justice; and the Department of the Treasury.

"(3) The organization or reorganization of any department or agency of the Government to the extent that the organization or reorganization related to a function or activity involving intelligence or intelligence-related activities.

"(4) Authorizations for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following: (a) the Central Intelligence Agency and Director of Central Intelligence; (b) the Defense Intelligence Agency; (c) the National Security Agency; (d) the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of Defense; (e) the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of State; and (f) the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation including all activities of the Intelligence Division."

These provisions also apply to successors of the above-named agencies.

The Select Committee was directed to report to the House on the nature and extent of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of Federal Departments and agencies. The Select Committee was also directed to conduct a study regarding specified aspects of intelligence and intelligence-related activities.

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: Yes.

Authority to report: For the purposes of accountability to the House, the Select Committee is authorized to "make regular and periodic reports to the House on the nature and extent of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States." The Select Committee is directed to call to the attention of the House or any House Committee appropriate matters requiring the attention of the House of Representatives. In making these reports to the House, the Select Committee should follow procedures consistent with section 7 of H. Res. 658 concerning the public disclosure of information. The Select Committee is directed to report on the study performed in accordance with section 3 of H. Res. 658 no later than the close of the 95th Congress.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes.

Provisions regarding staffing: The establishing resolution outlines the procedures to be followed in allowing staff access to classified information. The initial funding resolution, H. Res. 729 (August 5, 1977), authorized funds for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance: The Select Committee was directed by H. Res. 658 to obtain an annual report from the Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Secretaries of State and of Defense reviewing the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the agency or department and of foreign countries directed at the United States.

Special authorities: Section 7 established procedures by which the Committee can recommend public disclosure of information previously considered classified.

Authorization and expenditures.—95th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolutions: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$302,499 authorized by H. Res. 729 on August 5, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$966,906.25 as authorized by H. Res. 1034 on March 10, 1978.

96th Congress: \$927,401.99 as authorized by H. Res. 96 on February 26, 1979. Subsequent funding: \$972,420 as authorized by H. Res. 569 on February 28, 1980.

97th Congress: \$938,700 as authorized by H. Res. 115 on March 25, 1981.

Total Expenditures: January 1977 to September 30, 1981: \$3,206,869.64.

Total Authorizations: January 1977 to January 2, 1982: \$4,107,927.24.

Termination.—Original termination date: As a permanent Select Committee, it may only be terminated by an amendment to the House rules.

Extension: None.

Actual termination: Still in existence.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—During debate on the resolution, no opposition was expressed either to the need for an intelligence oversight committee or to creating it in the form of a permanent Select Committee. In contrast to a standing committee, with members selected by the two party organizations, the permanent Select Committee, according to Rep. Bolling, would be "basically a committee of the leadership."

Several Members sought to clarify that the Select Committee would not impinge on the jurisdictions of the standing committees on which they served. But the majority Leader, Rep. Wright of Texas, emphasized that the Select Committee was a necessary addition to the House committee system in that "the Congress will have for the first time one clear and identifiable mechanism through which it can control, manage, and oversee the far-reaching activities of our scattered intelligence and intelligence-related agencies of Government." Both Rep. Bolling and the Minority Leader, Rep. Rhodes of Arizona, did raise the possibility that the Select Committee might ultimately be merged into a joint committee on intelligence.

Opposition to the resolution focused on the parliamentary situation which precluded amendments being offered, and on two matters which would have been the subject of amendments, had they been permitted. A number of Members expressed concern about the need to protect the secrecy of sensitive intelligence, on the one hand, and the equal right of all Members to access to information in the possession of the House, on the other. Members of the minority party also expressed considerable disappointment that the resolution did not provide for equal or nearly equal representation of the two parties on the Select Committee. They cited the Senate's intelligence committee and the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as examples of committees on which the majority party enjoyed little if any partisan advantage. Rep. Bauman asserted that "there is no necessity to turn intelligence matters into political football," to which Rep. Bolling responded as follows:

If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows, I think, that I was the chairman of the subcommittee which led to the creation of the Ethics Committee, which was bipartisan. Also, I was chairman of the Select Committee which led to some reorganization of the committee structure, and that was bipartisan. The gentleman also knows that matters of intelligence, unlike matters of organization and matters of ethics, involve policy. And it is only reasonable, in my opinion, which I expect the committee to be totally nonpartisan—that is the reason for the majority leader and the minority leader being ex officio members—it is only reasonable for us to follow the mandate of the American people in our election to the House of Representatives on policy matters. And that is the reason the division would be as suggested.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POPULATION

Date of creation.—September 28, 1977.

Citation.—H. Res. 70; 95th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 258-147).

Membership.—Number of members: 16. Democrats: 11. Republicans: 5.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker.

Functions.—Mandate: H. Res. 70 authorized the creation of the Select Committee "to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of—

"(1) The causes of changing population conditions and their consequences for the United States and the world;

"(2) National, regional, and global population characteristics relative to the demands on limited resources and the ability of nations to feed, clothe, house, educate, employ, and govern their citizens and otherwise afford them an improved standard of living;

"(3) Various approaches to population planning (including the study of family planning technology, with emphasis on measures designed to reduce the frequency of conception rather than the termination of pregnancy, and the relationship of improved economic and social opportunities to family size) in order to ascertain those policies and programs, within the United States as well as other nations, which would be most effective in coping with unplanned population change; and

"(4) The means by which the United States Government can most effectively cooperate with and assist nations and international agencies in addressing successfully, in a noncoercive manner, various national, regional, and global population-related issues."

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Legislative authority: None.

Authority to report: The Select Committee on Population was authorized by H. Res. 70 to make a report on the results of its investigation and study as soon as practicable during the 95th Congress. H. Res. 70 also directed that any report of the Select Committee "be referred to the committee or committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matter * * *."

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: No.

Provisions regarding staffing: H. Res. 70 authorizes the Select Committee to employ and fix the compensation of professional staff, clerical, and stenographic assistants as necessary.

Executive Branch assistance. Not specified in establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The provisions of rule XI, clauses 1, 2, and 3 of the rules of the House which relate to rules of procedures for House committees also apply to the Select Committee. However, clause 2(m) of the House rules relating to subpoena power does not apply to the Select Committee on Population.

Authorizations and expenditures.—95th Congress: Authorization in establishing resolution: None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution: \$63,733 as authorized by H. Res. 843 on November 3, 1977.

Subsequent funding: \$750,000 as authorized by H. Res. 989 on April 4, 1978.

Total expenditures: January 1977 to January 3, 1979: \$661,446.19.

Total authorizations: January 1977 to January 2, 1979: \$813,733.

Termination.—Original termination date: End of 95th Congress. Extensions: None.

Actual termination: On March 21, 1979 the House rejected H. Res. 38 (96th Cong., 1st Sess.), a measure which would have re-cre-

ated the Select Committee on Population (Measure defeated by a recorded vote of 187-214).

Final Report (H. Rept. 905-1842) submitted on January 5, 1979.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The resolution creating the Select Committee was adopted by a recorded vote of 258 to 147, after a debate during which most Members agreed on the importance of curbing population growth, but expressed some disagreement over the need for a select committee to study the problem. Members supporting the resolution referred to the number of standing committees and subcommittees with some jurisdiction over population policies, and argued that a select committee would permit a coordinate and comprehensive study. Rep. Brown of Ohio, for example, expressed the expectation that the Select Committee would be able to avoid "the tunnel vision that is sometimes the natural product of the committee system." In opposition, Members asserted that the Select Committee would duplicate the efforts of standing committees and involve unnecessary costs, especially for foreign travel. Several Members opposing the resolution made particular reference to the reports of the Commission on Administrative Review and the 1973-74 Select Committee on Committees, both of which indicated concern with the proliferation of standing and select committee assignments.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Date of creation.—March 20, 1979.

Citation.—H. Res. 118, 96th Congress, 1st session (adopted by a recorded vote of 208-200).

Membership.—Number of members: 15. Democrats: 10. Republicans: 5.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Designated by the Speaker.

Functions.—"The Select Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study with respect to the operation and implementation of rules X, XI, and XLVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives including committee structure of the House, the number of committees and their jurisdiction, committee rules and procedures, media coverage of meetings, staffing, space, equipment, and other committee facilities.

(b) The select committee is authorized and directed to report to the House by bill, resolution, or otherwise, with respect to any matters covered in subparagraph (a): *Provided, however,* That the select committee shall not report to the House by bill or resolution recommendations relating to the optimum size of committees, the appropriate committee and subcommittee assignments, per Member, or the number of subcommittees or their jurisdictions, but such recommendations may be made to the respective party caucuses.

Significant changes in mandate during lifetime: None.

Authority to report: "The select committee shall report to the House on the matters referred to in section 2 as soon as practicable during the present Congress, but not later than February 1, 1980."

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

(c) The records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred to the "Committee on Rules."

House Resolution 533 provided for the extension of the reporting deadline but not the life and authority of the Select Committee on Committees.

The resolution allowed for the reporting deadline to be extended for 60 days, from February 1, 1980 to April 1, 1980. The committee and its authority were still set to expire on May 1, 1980, 30 days after the new reporting deadline.

All other provisions of House Resolution 118 remained unchanged, and no additional funds were required.

Executive Branch Assistance: not specified in establishing resolution.

Authorization in establishing resolution.—None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution.—\$525,000 as authorized by H. Res. 234 on April 26, 1979.

Subsequent funding: \$287,852 as authorized by H. Res. 580 on March 11, 1980.

Total expenditures: March 1979 to May 1980: \$738,802.68.

Total authorizations: March 1979 to May 1980: \$812,852.

Original termination date.—May 1, 1980.

Extensions: None. (Reporting deadline of Committee extended from February 1, 1980 to April 1, 1980. However, no extension of time for the committee and its authority as granted in H. Res. 118 was made.)

Final Report (H. Rept. 96-866) submitted April 1, 1980.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—After the termination of the Select Committee on Committees of the 93rd Congress (Bolling Committee) there were numerous calls for further reform of the House committee system.

In 1977, the House Commission on Administrative Review received recommendations from House Members concerning the need for another major review of the committee system.

On January 31, 1979, the House Democratic caucus adopted a proposal calling for the creation of a Select Committee on Committees to conduct a study and make recommendations with respect to the operations and implementation of House rule X, XI, and XLVIII. The caucus resolution further proposed that the select committee be authorized to make legislative recommendations with respect to such rules. Select committee reports, however, shall contain provisions relating to committee size and membership, assignment of members to committees or subcommittees, or subcommittee jurisdictions but such recommendations may be made to the respective party caucuses.

House Resolution 29, a resolution proposing the establishment of a Select Committee on Committees was introduced by Representative Trent Lott of Mississippi and the Republican leadership. This resolution was unanimously approved by the Republican conference on January 15, 1979.

House Resolution 118, proposing the establishment of a Select Committee on Committees was introduced by Representatives Thomas Foley of Washington and Abner Mikva of Illinois on February 15, 1979. This resolution was similar to and complied with the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus. The resolution

also followed the format of the model resolution appearing in "Guidelines for the Establishment of Select Committees," a subcommittee print approved by the Rules Committee and printed on October 31, 1977.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Date of creation.—March 29, 1979.

Citation.—H. Res. 53; 96th Congress, 1st Session (adopted by a recorded vote of 194-172).

Membership.—Number of members: 18. Democrats: 12. Republicans: 6.

Mode of selecting members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Designated by the Speaker.

Functions.—"The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction but shall have authority—

(1) to conduct a continuing study and review of (A) problems, programs, and policies related to the management of energy resources in the Outer Continental Shelf, and (B) the impact of the exploitation of energy resources of the Outer Continental Shelf on the marine, coastal, and human environment, including (but not limited to), appropriate oversight of the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978; and

(2) to provide appropriate support, assistance, and recommendations to any standing committee to whom is referred any bill or resolution to amend, or which is related to, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978.

(b) Nothing contained in this resolution shall be construed to limit or alter the legislative and oversight jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives."

Authority to report: "For the purpose of carrying out its responsibilities under this resolution the select committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such time and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee."

The select committee shall report to the House, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Executive Branch assistance: Not specified in establishing resolution.

Authorization in establishing resolution.—None.

Authorization in initial funding resolution.—\$290,000 as authorized by H. Res. 195 on April 5, 1979.

Subsequent funding.—\$116,000 as authorized by H. Res. 610 on March 25, 1980. (\$157,000 as authorized by H. Res. 573 defeated March 11, 1980).

Total expenditures: March 1979 to June 1980: \$396,222.48.

Total authorizations: March 1979 to June 30, 1980: \$406,000.

Termination.—Original terminations date: June 30, 1980.

Actual termination: June 30, 1980. Final Report (H. Rept. 96-1214) submitted on July 31, 1980.

Extension: None.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the committee.—The predecessor Ad Hoc Select OCS Committee had been created to consolidate in a single unit the legislative jurisdiction and staff expertise and resources necessary to evaluate OCS lands policy, and to design a program that would accelerate development and production from the OCS lands. The Ad Hoc Select Committee's work had culminated with the enactment of the Outer Continental Shelf Act Land Amendments as signed into law on September 18, 1978 (P.L. 95-372). The successor, Select Committee on OCS, was established primarily to exercise oversight over the implementation of OCS Land Act Amendments of 1978.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

Date of creation.—September 29, 1982.

Citation.—H. Res. 421; 97th Congress, 1st Session. Adopted by voice vote.

Membership.—No more than thirty. No party division specified in the resolution as passed.

Mode of selecting Members: Appointed by the Speaker.

Mode of selecting chairman: Appointed by the Speaker from among the Members of the Select Committee.

Functions.—Mandate: The Select Committee was authorized—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of children, youth, and families, including but not limited to income maintenance, health (including medical and child development research), nutrition, education, welfare, employment, and recreation;

(2) to study the use of all practicable means and methods of encouraging the development of public and private programs and policies which will assist American children and youth in taking a full part in national life and becoming productive citizens; and

(3) to develop policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to address the problems of childhood and adolescence.

Legislative authority: None. H. Res. 421 grants no legislative jurisdiction to the Select Committee and further provides that "nothing contained in this resolution shall be construed to limit or alter the legislative and oversight jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives."

Authority to report: The Select Committee is required to report:

(a) . . . to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such

recommendations as it deems advisable. (b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House. (c) Any such report shall be referred to the committee or committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter thereof. (d) The records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred to the Clerk of the House.

Authority.—Authority to issue subpoenas: Yes. Rule XI, 2(m) of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives, which was made applicable to the Select Committee, provides authority to issue subpoenas. Rule XI, clauses 1, 2, and 3, relating to procedures for committees, adoption of written committee rules, committee meetings, committee records, quorum requirements, travel limitations and broadcasting of committee hearings were also made applicable to the Select Committee.

Provisions regarding staffing: The Select Committee was authorized by H. Res. 421 to: (a) incur expenses in connection with its duties under this resolution. (b) In carrying out its functions under this resolution, the select committee is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to utilize the services of the staffs of those committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the select committee;

(3) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(4) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate which does not exceed the highest rate of basic pay, as in effect from time to time, of level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

(6) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

Executive Branch assistance: None specified in the establishing resolution.

Special authorities: The provisions of clauses 1, 2 and 3 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee. Clause 2 (i) of Rule XI, prohibiting committees from meeting during the five-minute without special leave, also applies to the Select Committee pursuant to H. Res. 421.

Authorizations and expenditures.—97th Congress: No authorization in establishing resolution. Expense resolutions, to be reported by the Committee on House Administration, are required by Rule XI, Clause 5. Authorization in initial funding resolution: No initial funding resolution enacted to date during the 97th Congress.

Termination.—Original termination date: As introduced, the Select Committee would have terminated at the end of the 99th Congress. The Rules Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the House (House Report 97-847) requires the termination of the Select Committee at the end of the 97th Con-

gress, or with the filing of its final report, whichever is earlier. This is in keeping with standard House practice. The Select Committee must be reconstituted by the 98th Congress for continuance.

Principal issues regarding the creation of the select committee.—In the current atmosphere of fiscal restraint and Federal cutbacks in social programs co-existing in an atmosphere of a poor economy, problems facing the sixty-four million children in the U.S. and their families have, it is argued, become more serious. Children and their families are the primary beneficiaries of many social programs the funding for which has been sharply reduced. Children comprise over fifty percent of those who benefit from the food stamp program, almost half of those eligible for medicaid, and over seventy percent of those who receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Yet there is no single agency or congressional committee that focuses on the diverse and complex policy issues bearing on children and youth.

Jurisdiction over issues relating to children, youth, and families, is shared by at least thirteen of the twenty-two House standing committees and numerous subcommittees. A listing of these jurisdictions highlights the complexity of these issues:

Agriculture—food stamps, nutritioin, consumer programs.

Armed Services—medical care and human relations for military personnel and their families, Selective Service.

Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs—housing, regulation of the housing industry (including landlord-tenant relations); community development and planning.

District of Columbia—all matters pertaining to children, youth and families residing in the District of Columbia.

Education and Labor—elementary, secondary and vocational education, child nutrition; youth employment and training; child labor; equal employment opportunities; youth camp safety; juvenile justice, runaway youth; early childhood services; education of the handicapped; child abuse; child adoption; alcohol and drug abuse education; volunteer programs.

Energy and Commerce—maternal and child health; consumer product safety; mental health; alcohol and drug abuse treatment; mental retardation; environmental health.

Foreign Affairs—international education; children of overseas foreign service officers and military; refugee children.

Interior and Insular Affairs—national parks and outdoor recreation; all matters pertaining to Indian children; all matters pertaining to children residing in American territories.

Judiciary—immigration, refugee, juvenile courts, civil rights, crime.

Post Office and Civil Service—health benefits for Federal employees; alternative work schedules; census.

Public Works and Transportation—surface transportation; urban and mass transportation.

Science and Technology—environmental health, safety; biomedical and pharmaceutical activities of Executive departments and agencies; science education; R&D involving governmental health, biomedical, nutrition and handicapped programs.

Ways and Means—disability insurance; health care and delivery systems, including Medicaid; public assistance, including welfare reform, supplemental security income, aid to families with dependent children, social services, child support, foster care, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps; unemployment compensation; tax credits for child care and jobs for targeted youth; tax exemptions for charitable organizations.

The Committees on Appropriations, Budget, and Government Operations have jurisdictions which are generally applicable to the issues and programs affecting children, youth and families.

One hundred fifty private organizations, including legal and psychiatric professional associations, education associations, social welfare associations, and religious groups, supported the establishment of the Select Committee. Two hundred twenty-eight Representatives co-sponsored H. Res. 421. According to its supporters, the Select Committee would give the House the means to comprehensively review the effect of programs and policies affecting children and to coordinate the development of methods within the public and private sectors to assist American children and adolescents.

SELECTED INFORMATION ON SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: 1947-82

Committee: Congress	Resolution and date of creation	Vote on resolution	Number of members	Majority party percentage—		Legislative authority	Subpena authority	Total authorization	Total expenditures (approximate)	Changes in mandate	Lifetime (mos)
				On committee	In House						
Select Committee on Newsprint: 80th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 58: Feb. 26, 1947	Record vote, 269-100	7	57	56	No	Yes	\$25,000.00	\$9,000	No	22
Select Committee on Foreign Aid: 80th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 296: July 22, 1947	Voice vote	19	58	56	No	No	125,000.00	114,000	No	9
Select Committee to Investigate Transaction on Commodity, Exchange: 80th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 404: Dec. 18, 1947	do	7	57	56	No	Yes	25,000.00	22,000	No	12
Select Committee on Lobbying Activities: 81st, 1st sess.	H. Res. 298: Aug. 12, 1949	do	7	57	60	No	Yes	95,000.00	60,000	No	16
Select Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals, Pesticides, and Insecticides in and with Respect to Food Products: 81st, 2d sess.	H. Res. 323: June 20, 1950	do	7	57	60	No	Yes	105,000.00	52,000	Yes	29
Select Committee to Investigate Abuses in Education, Training, and Loan guaranty Programs of World War II Veterans: 82d, 1st sess.	H. Res. 74: Feb. 2, 1951	do	9	55	60	No	Yes	105,000.00	97,000	Yes	23
Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Katyn Forest Massacre: 82d, 1st sess.	H. Res. 474: Aug. 28, 1950	do	7	57	54	No	Yes	85,000.00	64,000	Yes	15
Select Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations and Other Organizations: 82d, 2d sess.	H. Res. 561: Apr. 4, 1952	Record vote, 194-158	7	57	54	No	Yes	190,000.00	163,000	Yes	25
83d, 1st sess.	H. Res. 217: July 27, 1953	Record vote, 209-163									

Select Committee to conduct an investigation and study of offensive and undesirable books, magazines, and comic books: 82d, 2d sess.	H. Res. 596: May 12, 1952.....	Voice vote.....	9	55	54	No.....	Yes.....	25,000.00	20,000	No.....	7
Select Committee to investigate incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R.: 83d, 1st sess.	H. Res. 346: July 27, 1953.....	do.....	17	57 (55)	51	No.....	Yes.....	180,000	150,640	Yes.....	17
Select Committee to Investigate Survivors Benefits for Deceased and Former Members of the Armed Services:											
83d, 2d sess.....	H. Res. 549: Aug. 4, 1954.....	do.....	5	60	51	Yes.....	No.....	55,000.00	34,000	No.....	17
84th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 35: Feb. 2, 1955.....										
Select Committee to Investigate and Study the Financial Position of the White County Bridge Commission: 84th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 244: May 25, 1955.....	Record vote, 205-166.....	3	67	53	No.....	Yes.....	10,000.00	4,000	No.....	12
Select Committee on the House Recording Studio: 84th, 2d sess.	Public Law 84-624: June 27, 1956 (H.R. 11473).		3	67	53	No.....	No.....	NA	NA	No.....	247
Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration: 85th, 2d sess.	H. Res. 496: Mar. 5, 1958.....	Voice vote.....	13	54	54	Yes.....	Yes.....	185,000.00	NA	No.....	10
Select Committee to Investigate the Administration of the Export Control Act of 1949: 87th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 403: Sept. 7, 1961.....	Division, 90-1.....	5	60	60	No.....	Yes.....	50,000.00	48,000	No.....	8
Select Committee on Government Research: 88th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 504: Sept. 11, 1963.....	Record vote, 336-0.....	9	55	59	No.....	Yes.....	553,000.00	320,000	No.....	15
Select Committee to Study the Factors Relating to the General Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages: 88th, 2d sess.	H. Res. 847: Sept. 30, 1964.....	Voice vote.....	5	60	59	No.....	No.....	None	None	No.....	3
Select Committee on Standards and Conduct: 89th, 2d sess.	H. Res. 1013: Oct. 15, 1966.....	Record vote, 256-0.....	12	50	67	Yes.....	Yes.....	10,000.00	NA	No.....	3

Select Committee on Aging: 17 93d, 2d sess.	H. Res. 988: Jan. 3, 1975.....	Record vote, 323-84.....	3 28	68	55	No.....	Yes.....	106,429,516.00	11 5,438,159	No.....	(9)
Select Committee on Intelligence.....	H. Res. 138: Feb. 19, 1975.....	Record vote, 286-120.....	4 10	60 (69)	67	No.....	Yes.....	750,000.00	444,000	No.....	12
Ad Hoc Select Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf:	H. Res. 591: July 17, 1975.....	Voice vote.....									
94th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 412: Apr. 22, 1975.....	do.....	5 16	69	67	Yes.....	Yes.....	1,004,000.00	880,516	No.....	44
95th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 97: Jan. 11, 1977.....	do.....									
95th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 433: Mar. 30, 1977.....	Record vote, 230-181.....									
Select Committee to Study the Problem of U.S. Servicemen Missing in Action in Southeast Asia: 94th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 335: Sept. 11, 1975.....	Record vote, 394-3.....	10	70	67	No.....	Yes.....	350,000.00	174,000	No.....	18
Select Committee on Professional sports: 94th, 2d sess.	H. Res. 1186: May 18, 1976.....	Voice vote.....	13	54	67	No.....	Yes.....	30,000.00	9,000	No.....	7
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control: 94th, 2d sess.	H. Res. 1350: July 29, 1976.....	Record vote, 361-10.....	6 18	67	67	No.....	Yes.....	3,407,248.00	2,651,293	No.....	(9)
95th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 77: Jan. 11, 1977.....	Voice vote.....									
96th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 13.....	Recorded vote, 338-75.....									
97th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 13.....	Recorded vote, 276-101.....									
Select Committee on Assassinations:											
94th, 2d sess.....	H. Res. 1540: Sept. 17, 1976.....	Record vote, 280-65.....	12	67	67	No.....	Yes.....	5,954,400.00	5,289,969	Yes.....	27
95th, 1st sess.....	H. Res. 222: Feb. 2, 1977.....	Record vote, 237-164.....									
Select Committee on Ethics: 95th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 383: Mar. 9, 1977.....	Record vote, 410-1.....	19	68	66	Yes.....	Yes.....	397,000.00	266,191	No.....	22
Select Committee on Congressional Operations: 95th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 420: Mar. 28, 1977.....	Record vote, 211-147.....	7	71	66	No.....	Yes.....	1,340,000.00	1,575,688	No.....	21
Ad Hoc Committee on Energy: 95th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 508: Apr. 21, 1977.....	Voice vote.....	7 37	67	66	Yes.....	Yes.....	325,833.00	220,247	No.....	20
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: 95th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 658: July 14, 1977.....	Record vote, 229-169.....	13	69	66	Yes.....	Yes.....	144,107,927.00	143,206,869	No.....	(9)
Select Committee on Population: 95th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 70: Sept. 28, 1977.....	Record vote, 258-147.....	16	NA	66	No.....	No.....	813,733.00	661,446	No.....	18
Select Committee on Committees: 96th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 118: Mar. 20, 1979.....	Record vote, 208-200.....	15	NA	NA	Yes.....	No.....	812,852.00	738,802	No.....	12

SELECTED INFORMATION ON SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: 1947-82—Continued

Committee: Congress	Resolution and date of creation	Vote on resolution	Number of members	Majority party percentage—		Legislative authority	Subpara authority	Total authorization	Total expenditures (approximate)	Changes in mandate	Lifetime (mos)
				On committee	In House						
Select Committee on Outer Continental Shelf: 96th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 53: Mar. 29, 1979	Record vote, 194-172	18	NA	NA	No	No	406,000.00	396,222	No	15
Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families: 97th, 1st sess.	H. Res. 421: Sept. 29, 1982	Voice vote	(^a)	NA	NA	No	Yes	NA	NA	No	3

¹ Increased to 9 by H. Res. 438, Mar. 4, 1954.
² Increased to 11 by H. Res. 115.
³ Increased to 34, 95th Cong.; 45, 96th Cong.; 54, 97th Cong.
⁴ Increased to 13 by H. Res. 591.
⁵ Increased to 19, 96th Cong.; increased to 19 97th Cong.
⁶ Still in existence.
⁷ Increased to 40 by H. Res. 509.
⁸ Not more than thirty.
⁹ Jan. 1977 to Jan. 2, 1982.
¹⁰ Jan. 1975 to Jan. 2, 1982.
¹¹ Jan. 1975 to Sept. 30, 1981.
¹² Total committee expenditures exceeded total committee authorizations by \$235,688.28. This is because of overlap in expenses incurred during the transition period between the dissolution of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and the establishment of the House Select Committee on Congressional Operations.
¹³ The Select Committee was created by a floor amendment to H. Res. 982, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, which added a new section to House Rule X, establishing the Select Committee as a permanent body.
¹⁴ Not available.
¹⁵ Decreased to 17, July 1976 to Jan. 2, 1982.
¹⁶ Decreased to 17, July 1976 to Jan. 2, 1982.
¹⁷ The Select Committee was created by a floor amendment to H. Res. 982, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, which added a new section to House Rule X, establishing the Select Committee as a permanent body.